SCRIPTVRE EVIDENCE

FOR

Baptizing the INFANTS of *Covenanters*,

Produced

At CORK in two Sermons, one Preached *April* the 7. the other *Iune* the 2.

Anno Dom. 1653.

Ex Dono Eruditissimi Authoris.

LUKE 18. 16.

Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the Kingdome of God.

GEN. 17. 7.

I will establish my Covenant between me & thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee.

1. COR. 7. 14. *Your Children are Holy.*

PRINTED,

For T. *Taylor* Widow, and are to be sold at her Shop in CORK.

SCRIPTURE EVIDENCE

FOR

Baptizing the INFANTS of CONFEDERATES,

Produced

At CORK in two Sermons, one Preached 4 April the 7, the other June the 2.

Anno Dom. 1695.

LUKE 18. 16.

Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the Kingdome of God.

GEN. 17. 7.

I will Establish my Covenant between me & thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and thy Seed after thee.

1. COR. 7. 14. Your Children are Holy.

PRINTED,

For T. Taylor Widow, and are to be sold at her Shop in CORK.

To the READER.

Christian Reader,

THis discourse was publickly Preached at *Cork* in two Sermons, the First explained the Text, the Second improved the Arguments, which occasions me (in conjunction) to change the method though not the materials.

On deliverie of the First, a publick Dispute (on that, a second) was desired, appointed. To the former Dr. *Harding* offered himself (five days præcedaneous:) to the later he publickly chalenged Mr. *Murcot*; of the First, he ordered, of the Second he promised, that the procedure should be Scholastical; yet in neither endeavoured to demonstrate his own, confute our tenet, or return direct answer; but (like an old beaten Souldier) kept close in his trenches, some while Rhetorizing against Logick, & most, while interposing impertinent questions, and thereon orations *populo ut placeret*, neither of use in the reiglement of their consciences

sciences, nor of concernment to the point in hand.

He hath since apologiz'd for these Vagaries, as light skirmishes before the main Battel; the materials preach'd, I have wrote, & publish'd, let them receive the assault. Publick writings I presume will be less liable the Doctors to extravagancies, his and mine to misreports: And both (if of any) of more common and lasting advantage.

I am sensible, that by this undertaking, I cast my self into the mouthes of violent Antagonists, (of more heat than light:) but if thereby such pestilential expressions (as are instanced *p.* 4, 5.) may be prevented, I hope that (like *Curtius* personally suffering) I shall therein rejoyce. Physicians are willing to defile their fingers in their patients dung, that they may be instruments to effect a Cure.

In this discourse, *nova non novi*, I pretend not to know any new Light, or to make known any Noveltie; this Structure derives from others, some Ancient, some Moderne (though, through want of suitable Characters, it wants those acknowledgements:) the composure is only mine, and as mine defe-

 ctive,

ctive, more defective than others built with theſe materials; yet am I induced to make it common, not ſo much to anſwer the Doctors chalenge, as becauſe others are not common here. *Vtile eſt plures libros fieri à pluribus, diverſo ſtilo, non diverſa fide, de rebus eiſdem: ut ad plurimos res ipſa perveniat, ad alios ſic, ad alios autem ſic*, &c. Aug. de Trinit. lib. 1. cap. 3.

Perſonal concernments I have purpoſely baulked, (except that *pag.* 73. neceſſarie to be inſerted, becauſe it led me from the point in hand) that the Lord's cauſe might be ſingly diſputed. Some propoſitions are likewiſe aſſerted, without proofs ſubjoyned: but ſuch (I conceive) if not publickly known, yet confeſſed by the Contrarie minded, and accidental, (as explicatorie) rather than eſſential unto this Controverſie.

Reader, the Light here is God's, give him the praiſe: the obſcuritie mine, vouchſafe me thy prayers; I ſhall ſerve thee more, when thou prayeſt more for me

The unworthieſt labourer in the Lord's vine-yard: and thy ſervant in the Miniſterie of the Goſpel,

EDWARD WORTH.

The Printer to the Reader.

Reader,

AS want of a Corrector *at the Press, cost me some trouble, so it will thee a little pains: many sentences are mispointed, divers letters, some few words omitted, some misplaced, some mistook, and a few Texts miscited. VVhat is of easie cure I shall leave to thy care: to help thee in what I conceive more difficult, I have annexed this Suppletorie.*

Page 27. line 24. *put* 3. pag. 36. l. 24. *for* 1. *read* 10. pag. 41. l. 16. *put* Secondly. Pag. 47. l. 13. *for* 37. *read* 73. *and for* 17. *read* 67. pag. 57. l. 22. *add* 12. p. 69. l. 11. *for* 1. *Sam. read* 2. *Sam.* pag. 93. l. 13. *for* the, *read* their. pag. 94. l. 22. *for* condisecention, *read* condescention. pag. 104. l. 7. *add* 15. pag. 129. line 23. *put* Thirdly.

pag. 49. l. 15. *for* Arabi[illegible]k, *read* Rabbinick.

ACTS

ACTES 2: 38: 39:

REpent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Ieſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of Sinns: & yee ſhall Receiue the gift of the holy Ghoſt. For the promiſe is vnto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, euen as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.

CHAP I:

Children Intereſſ'd in parentall Euill and good.

Sect. 1. SVCH is the power, of our *great* God, that he is able, to diſſolve the moſt ſtony, change the moſt hoſtile heart. Such is the mercy, of our *good* God, that he is willing, to receive vnto grace the moſt ſtony thus diſſolved, the moſt hoſtile thus changed. The Occaſion of this Text, is ſo eminent an inſtance hereof, that Gods power

& goodneſſe ſeeme to contend, whether moſt ſhall be admired:

5:2 As the Iewes did ſadly Imprecate about two moneths paſt, *his blood be vpon us & our Children*; ſo now being *pricked at the heart* by Peters Sermon, they ſadly ſupplicate *Men & Brethren VVhat ſhall wee doe?* that cumulative Sinn of crucifying Chriſt, in its guilt, and curſe reached their Children, in ſome reſpects, no leſſe than themſelves; and therefore in their Sorrow for Sinn, & Complaint for Sorrow, they had regard (I conceive) to their ſo neerly vnited relatives, againſt whom the Lord frequently both threatneth, & executes ſome kind of judgements, for parentall tranſgreſſions. For ſince by that Imprecation, their Children were rendred obnoxious to Iudgement, how could the ſenſe of that judgement be lay'd aſide in this Sorrow? q. d. We and our Children are vndone *Men and Brethren what ſhall we doe?*

God

t. 3. God is not more prone to ſeveritie then mercy, in like ſort as the Children are Involved in their Fathers Sinn, ſo are they Involved in their Fathers Sorrow: are they in danger to be diſcovenanted, diſchurched on their Fathers tranſgreſſion? they ſhall be Continued in Church and Covenant *quoad Oeconomiam externam* on their Fathers repentance, & the Cordiall adminiſtred to theſe broken hearts, is as extenſive to cheere them, as the guilt was to paine them. *The promiſe is made to you & your Children: Repent & be baptized* &c. but though I conſent to ſuch as oppoſe Infants baptiſme, with the greateſt abilities, that this Text hath ſpeciall reſpect to theſe Iewes, as vnder this Sinn & curſe: yet doe I conceive the exhortation and reaſons to be of common concernment, generall vſe, and applicable if there never had beene that Imprecation or guilt.

t. 4. The two vndivided principles of du-

ty and privilege (wherein the whole of a Chriſtian conſiſts) divide this Text. The firſt place is proper to duty, that, like Iohn Baptiſt prepares the way: the next place is proper to privilege, that, like Chriſt Ieſus perfects duty.

The duty 2 fold { Repent / be baptized &c.

The privilege 2 fold { *defuturo* yee ſhall receive &c. / *depreſenti* the promiſe is &c.

§. 5. At the deſire of many of you, I am come to this place at preſent to declare my apprehenſions on this text, (ſo farr as relating to the baptiſme of infants of incovenanted parents) and as ſome declaring (on the ſame ſubject) againſt this Doctrine under the characters of Antichriſtian, worſe than drunkenneſſe, vncleaneſſe, and ſuch morall wickedneſſe, as bad as

the Idolatry of Baal-Peor, and provocative of the like iudgment (the peſtilence) againſt this place (and other where as the divells baptiſme) found no publique interruption in ſuch declamations: So I deſire that this Congregatiō may not be diſturbed: but if when I have finiſhed my Sermon, any perſon contrary-minded object, I ſhall then returne anſwer by the Lords grace, in words of truth & ſoberneſſe.

5.6. And leſt the frequent uſe of that terme *Anabaptiſt* might ſavour to any of bitterneſſe, I præmiſe this ſerious profeſſion, that it is not deſigne to render others odious by a title, but neceſſitie, for diſtinction-ſake that cauſeth it's vſe. Yet doe *I* not conceive the ſame is either injurious, or vnſuitable, to whom I apply it.

CHAP. II.

Inward Grace not antecedent essentially to outward Baptisme.

S. 1. THE first duty prescrib'd is *repentance*, μετανοησατε *repent*. On these converts (some of the first Stones in this new Building) Peter seemes to me imposing this duty, as Paul layes the same among the principles and fundamentalls of Christian Religion. *Heb:* 6: 1: and what repentance there is prescribed, is there described, μετανοια ἀπο νεκρων ἐργων *repentance from dead workes*, not only sorrow for, this anteceded *in their hearts pricked*; but repentance from dead workes, which was to follow in their *lives corrected*; sense of Sinn, sorrow for Sinn confession of Sinn, are preparatives to, and companions of actuall repentance. *Life amendment is properly this repentance in the Text required.*

S 2. Of this duty, considered absolutely I may

may not now speake: but as it respecteth the Doctrine of Baptisme. And whereas from the order of the words, this argument is by some Anabaptists, vsually inferred as conclusive: *repentance is here first mẽtioned therefore baptisme cãnot rightly be administred unto any, vnlesse actually he first repent:* I deny the consequence & to inforce this negation propound these instances. 1. That it is inconsequent to argue, that repentance must necessarily antecede Baptisme, meerly because repentance is mentioned before baptisme.

2. That it is not possible for any Minister in fayth to Baptize any person, according to rule, if the order of these words prescribe the rule, according to which alone Baptisme must be administred.

3. That the inference seemes absurd and vnreasonable because persons Baptized at the first planting of the Church vnder the Gospel administration were

were so qualified: therefore none in a Church planted vnlesse so qualified, can be rightly Baptized.

4. I shall breifly declare my judgement, how I conceive Faith & Repentance reqnired to Baptisme.

s. 3. First an argument drawne meerely from priority of words in the order of the phrase, is not necessarily conclusive. Scripture observes not *prius et posterius*. This is first mentioned, therefore first done, or first to be done, is a *non sequitur*, the gift of the *Holy Ghost* in this Text is named, and promised, as subsequent to baptisme: Yet somtimes vouchsafed, not only in order, but in causality as antecedent *Actes* 10. 47. Iohns baptisme is mentioned before his preaching *Mark* 1: 4. Confession with the mouth præcedes beleif with the heart *Rom:* 10: 9. Yet none can aright confesse with the mouth, who doth not first beleive with the heart. Add hereto that the body is put before the Soule

Soule in glorifying God 1 *Cor:* 6: 20: yet is the soule first acted to the Lords glory. The words of the mouth have the first place, the meditation of the heart the last *Psal* 19. 14: Yet the issues of life proceed from the heart *Pro:* 4: 23. The Cup likewise is mentioned before the bread in that other Sacrament of the Lords supper. 1: *Cor* 10: 16. Instances of this kind are infinite, & obvious

s. 4. Secondly It is impossible for any Minister in faith, & according to rule, to baptize any person; if the order of these words prescribes the rule according to which alone, baptisme must be administred in regard

Repentance here denotes { amendment of life *Heb* 6: 1. / with its adjuncts { Intireness, / Continuedness, / Sincereness,

1. Repentance here denotes *life amendment*, but the Apostles even in this Chapter baptized 3000 that same day without waiting to observe whether or noe their lives were amended. Either therefore the example of the Apostles in this instance prescribes not a

rule to our practise; or it is impossible for any Minister in faith & according to rule to baptize any, if the order of these words prescribes a contrary.

Secondly Repentance here denotes *intire repentance*; and either man in this world is capable of a state of perfection, in which his life needes no further amendment: or no Minister can baptize any person in faith, & according to rule, if that intireness must antecede baptisme.

Thirdly Repentance here denotes *continued repentance*; and as repentance is knowne by it's fruits, so is it's continuance by their continuance. Hypocrites may be greene many yeares; wherefore if this order of wordes prescribes the rule, according to which alone, baptisme must be administred, none can baptize any in faith & according to rule, 'till the last period of life.

Fourthly Repentance here denotes *hearty sincere repentance*; and no Minister can certainly know the heartinesse and sinceritie of any Man's, repentance, & therefore cannot in faith baptize any person, if this were the

rule, according to which alone baptisme ought to be administred.

8, 5. Some perhaps may imagine to evade these inferences, by expounding their meaning thus. *That true faith and repentance are necessary to the persons baptized.*

Answ: First 'Tis not the question whether true faith and repentance be necessary to the baptized, in order to other ends? but *whether antecedent essentially, in order to externall baptisme?* many qualifications are necessarie *to the partakers*, that they may be saved (as finall perseverance): which are not antecedent essentially *to the participation*, that they may be baptized. Faith is necessarie, to the hearers of the word preached: yet if anteecedent essentially to hearing, *faith* in noe instance *could come by hearing*, contrary to *Rom* 10: 17.

Secondly, True faith and repentance (as Covenant conditions) are as necessarie to the persons of Children, as men, 'tis not said, *he that beleiues not, shall not be baptized*; but expresly said, he that beleives not shall be damned *Mar*: 16: 16. Either therfore noe

Children are capable of ſalvation: or ſome Children capable of true faith and repentance. *i. e.* in ſeed & habit though not in exerciſe & act.

Ob: But Children cannot manifeſt faith & Repentance.

Anſw: Firſt I have ſeene noe Text cited by any Anabaptiſts intending more than the *having* true faith & repentance, & *this Children may haue; as they haue a reaſonable ſoule*, though they exerciſe not any acts of reaſon.

Secondly the higheſt manifeſtations of grace (as to us) amount to no more, than an *externall-couenant-relation*; and the Children of incovenanted parents are aſwell ſuch *relatiues externally*, as adult profeſſors.

Laſtly ſuppoſing true faith and repentance antecedent eſſentially to baptiſme; either the manifeſtations hereof, on which baptiſme muſt be adminiſtred, are *infallible and certaine*: and then no hypocrite can be baptized. Or *probable and conjecturall*, and then none can *in faith* baptize another, *i: e:* he cannot be aſſured, by thoſe manifeſtations, that the baptiſme adminiſtered by him hath

hath all its *eſſentialls*; if the premiſes be only *conjecturall*, the concluſion cannot be *certaine*. *VVhich is ſufficient to cleare the ground & reaſon of the aboue inferences.*

Baptiſme cannot be adminiſtred according to rule, vnleſſe it hath the eſſentialls: nor in faith, vnleſſe the Miniſter be aſſured that it hath the eſſentialls.

s. 6. Thirdly the inference ſeemes abſurd & vnreaſonable, becauſe ſome baptized at the firſt planting of the Church vnder the Goſpell diſpenſation were ſo qualified; therefore none in a Church planted vnleſſe ſo qualified may be baptized.

Though the eſſentialls *Eccleſiæ conſtitutæ et conſtituendæ* be the ſame; Yet the accidentall appendages differ. When Circumciſion was firſt Ordained, Abraham was adult, & moſt of his Servants circumcis'd by him. When ſucceeding Proſelytes, were to be added to the ſame Church: preaching the word muſt, and did antecede Circumciſion but when Parents beleived the word preached, renounced former Idolatry, & were Circumciſed, they partooke by covenant, aſ-

well

well Parentall, as Perſonall Church intereſt: and their Children were not obliged vnto this method, but by Circumciſion owned, & ſolemnly admitted unto Church-Membership, by virtue of their Covenant-birth-priviledge.

s. 7. At the firſt planting of the new Teſtament adminiſtration, baptiſme was often attended, with miraculous gifts of the holy Ghoſt; a *Sceptique* & Seeker thence inferrs; no ſuch gift, no true baptiſme. But even the *Anabaptiſts* rightly anſwer, extraordinary meſſengers, with a meſſage extraordinary ought to be furniſhed with power and evidence proportionate, *i. e.* extraordinary: that all the world might be convinced, they and their meſſage to be from above: but that reaſon ceaſeth where the Church and the new Teſtament adminiſtration is planted: the ordinance, Scripture, Goſpell, Chriſt, owned. *Scaffolds are neceſſary in the Houſe building; but plucked downe, when the Houſe built.* The anſwer they give to thoſe, we give to them. And in my judgement the *Seekers* argument, from *Mark* 16:

17.

17. is much more difficult & forceable. If then this answer when mannaged by themselves is of virtue sufficient, to remove a greater difficulty: I beseech them to mannage it likewise in this case, to remove a lesser, the grounds whereof are the same, and the collection more remote. This I speake not to justifie the error of the *Seeker*: but to evidence the error of this argument. If therefore the *Anabaptists* would instance a precedent agreeable to the State of this Question, *Let them exemplifie one person, through the whole Booke of God, borne of Christian Parents under the Gospell dispensation, whose baptisme was refused or euen delayed, till he adult.* But if no such instance can be made, those generall expressions of *whole housholds* baptized, cannot in reason be vnderstood exclusive of Children, nor the mention of those 3000 in this chapter, especially considering, in that *communitie* which these held together, *V*: 44. their Children were *Interessed*, or else not *provided for*; and if Interessed in this *Church communitie*, then likewise interessed in a *Church-membership*, and so capable of baptisme.

s. 8.

s. 8. Lastly I shall breifely declare my *judgement* how I conceive faith and repentance required to baptisme. First I conceive a *renewed-externall-covenant-relation denominating* the *subjects* (*quoad homines*) *beleivers or relatiues to Christ* (*in the Christian faith & Religion*) *required to baptisme.*

Whence it comes to passe (*accidentally* as to the nature of baptisme) that those who being adult externally relate not to Christ, ought personally first to owne Christ externally before by admission unto this Sacrament they be externally owned by Christ.

s. 9. Secondly I conceive as baptisme doth seale the Covenant of grace, so faith & repentance (at least in *their seeds & principles*) are required as necessary to the person Baptized, in order to the participation of the eternall good things, as promised by *Couenant* so sealed by *baptisme.*

The difference of these 2 propositions ariseth, from the different consideration of Baptisme:

First *precisely*, in it selfe, to the validitie whereof, an *externall-couenant-relation* suffi-

ceth;

eeth; as in the first proposition. 2 *complexly*, with all the Covenant fruites and effects, to the attainement whereof true grace is required; as in the 2d proposition. If this distinction were seriously pondered, it would resolve many scruples, aswell concerning *this Sacrament*; as the other of the Lords Supper.

s. 10. Having thus removed the rubbish of the consequence inferred from the order of these and the like words; I shall labour (by the helpe of grace) to cleare this position which (being at the bottome of this controversie) is of great use, if not necessitie, to be cleared.

s. 11. *That to the participation of the externall ordinance of baptisme, true faith and repentance are not essentially and necessarily antecedent.* And to this purpose, I offer these arguments.

First if true faith and repentance be essentially & necessarily antecedent, to the participation of the outward ordinance of Baptisme; then no person can be Baptized, (as to the *essence* of Baptisme) without such true faith and repentance; but suppose an *Hypocrite*

crite baptized, in his hypocrisie, and after that baptisme converted to true faith and repentance; whether or no, on such his conversion, ought he to be Rebaptized? if *no*, how could his baptisme want the *essentialls*, Though it wanted true faith & repentance? if *yea*, why did not the Apostles practise such Rebaptization? and why did Peter prescribe, not it, but only Repentance, to *Simon Magus*, though baptized an Hypocrite? *Actes* 8: 22.

s. 11. Secondly the extraordinary & miraculous gift of the *Holy Ghost* was often separated from true faith and repentance: yet on this *gift* the Apostle grounds the baptisme, of both *Cornelius & his Family*; and those who beleeved of the Circumcision, excepted not against it, as that which was not (inseparably) accompanyed with true faith and repentance *Actes* 10: 44: 45: 46: 47 48. Either therefore the Apostles ground for their baptisme was not sufficient, or if sufficient, then true faith and repentance are not essentially and necessarily antecedent to Baptisme.

s. 12. Thirdly if the validitie of baptisme doth not depend, upon the intire Covenant-fruits & effects, then the essence of it doth not depend, on the *dispositions* necessarie to those fruites. The antecedent may be thus prooved. Those Disciples who left Christ *Iohn* 6: 66: were Baptized *Iohn* 4: 1. In the *Church* of Ephesus some should arise, even *of themselues*, speaking perverse things, and drawing *Disciples* after them *Act:* 20: 30. *Simon Magus* though in the gall of bitternes, & bond of iniquitie was *baptized*: & prescribed to *repent* after baptisme *Acts* 8: 13. compared with 21: 22: 23. Either therefore baptisme was not *validly* administered by the *Apostles*, to these suscipients: Or the validitie of baptisme doth not depend, upon the intire Covenant-fruits & effects. Nor consequently the essence of it upon the dispositions of true faith & repentance necessarie thereto.

s. 13. Fourthly That which in a constituted Church, the Lord ordinarily conveyes, at and by baptisme, is not essentially antecedent to baptisme. But in a constituted Church, the Lord ordinarily conveyes the

firſt *grace* to the *election* of *grace*, at and by baptiſme. *Iohn* 3: 5 the *Spirit* is the principall efficient: the *water* of baptiſme is the ordinarie inſtrument. The Spirit can convey grace without this inſtrument. But ordinarily he doth it by this inſtrument. And if his Providence affoards this, we have noe promiſe of the grace without it. *Eph:* 5: 26 To the *cleanſing* of the Church *Chriſt* uſeth the *waſhing* of water and the *word*. This *word* is externall, in the Preaching of the Goſpell; that *waſhing* therefore is likewiſe externall, in the adminiſtration of Baptiſme. *Tit:* 3: 5: the *lauer* of regeneration, and *renewing* of the Holy Ghoſt, are mentioned diſtinctly, the one reſpecting the outward inſtrument; the other reſpecting the inward grace.

To ſay, that God ordinarilie conveyes the firſt grace immediatly, and without any externall ordinance, is 1. *gratis dictum*. Is there any promiſe of ſuch conveyance? 2. a large foundation for the *Seeker's* ſuperſtructure. If begeting grace, why not nouriſhing, ſtrengthning, increaſing grace?

To ſay, that Children are not capable of the

the first grace, is to say, that because Children are not active, therefore they are not passive for of the first grace wee are meerly susceptive.

Fiftly Consider the absurdities of the contrary tenet; the baptizer cannot (in faith) administer baptisme to any; nor usually the baptized (in faith) receive it, As appeares by the second instance. P 9: 10.

s. 14. Nor are these instances of single use to vindicate this Text: but of common influence, on most those Scriptures urged by the *Anabaptists* in debating this question. That of *Marke* 16: 16: *He that beleeueth and is baptized shall be saued*, is answered. First by the *first instance*, an argument meerly from priority of phrase is not conclusive. And secondly by the second instance, *for* by beleeving, the externall profession of beleife, cannot be vnderstood, this would neither answer that text, nor the Analogie of faith; reade it so, and you will see with ease the absurditie. *He that professeth* (though he only professe) *and is baptized shalll be saved.* And if true faith and beleife be here vnderstood;

then

then the *Second instance* answers the argument, for if this be the rule according to which alone, Baptisme must be administred, then none can be baptized according to rule, unlesse first he truly beleeve.

s. 15. That text of the *Eunuch Actes* 8: 36: 37. And that of the *Corinthians Actes* 18: 8: are answered by the *third instance*; this was the method, in first admitting aliens to the Christian Church: therefore this method must be observed towards all, in all constituted Christian Churches, is absurdly inconsequent. To which I shall add, first that as Peter argues, *Actes* 10: 47 The right of the *Gentiles* to baptisme, & that no man should *forbid* them, since they had received the Holy Ghost; so *Philip Actes* 8: 37. Seemes to me to argue the *Eunuchs* right unto baptisme, & that nothing could *hinder* him *seeing he beleeved with all his heart*. Which sense the conjunction translated *if* beares, in the three learned Languages ☐ ℵ *Pro:* 23: 17: 18. Let not thy heart envy Sinners *for surely i: e. because* surely there is an end. Thus the vulger renders it *Quia*. ει *Acts* 4: 9. *i. e.* because

or

or as it is in the margent, *seeing that* wee this day are examined &c. *Si* thus in Virgill

——*Non si miserum fortuna Sinonem*
Finxit &c.——

So in this text ἐι πιστευεις *seeing that* thou beleevest with all thy heart. The Holy Ghost directed *Philip* unto this *Eunuch*. This *Eunuch* had bin worshipping at Ierusalem, returning he read in the Bible, desired instruction *Philip* preacheth Iesus to him, he *hearkneth submitteth & craueth baptisme*; which being antecedent to this expression of *Philip*, seeme to me to be sufficient *evidence* to *Philip*, that this *Eunuch* beleeued with all his heart. And farr greater then that subsequent verball declaration *I beleeue that Iesus Christ is the Sonne of God*. When therefore their approach to the water, occasioned the *Eunuch* to make this question, *see here is water what doth hinder me to be baptized?* as if that which hitherto hindered had beene, that they came not to water, but now saith the *Eunuch*, see *here* is water. Philip seemes to me to be so far from *doubting* of this *Eunuch's* faith & sinceritie, so farr from *raising doubts* in this *Eunuch* concerning

cerning his faith and ſinceritie, whether he *beleeued?* & whether he beleeved *with all his heart?* that rather he readily conſents to his deſire of baptiſme & commends his faith & ſinceritie, as the fountaine of that deſire; *thou maiſt be baptized, ſeeing that thou beleeueſt with all thy heart.* From which example as alſo from that of the Corinthians *Acts* 18. we may conclude, that thoſe who beleive with all the heart ought to be baptized; and I preſume none who will baptize any, refuſe to baptize any ſuch. But in regard *affirmatiue propoſitions are not excluſiue*; true beleevers were baptized, and ought to be baptized, therefore none muſt be baptized, but true beleevers, is no better an inference then Crowes are black, therefore nothing is black but Crowes. The argument I thinke will not offend ſince 'tis Mr Tombs his. Secondly compare this text of *Act.* 8: with that paralell expreſſion vſed by the Leper to Chriſt *Matt* 8: *Luke* 5: 12 *Mar:* 1. 40 if *thou wilt*, thou *canſt*, ſo there: if thou beleeveſt with all thy heart thou maiſt, ſo here. But as from that, the negative argument, is inconſe-

quent

quent (*God cannot make whole vnlesse he will*) so likewise from this (thou maist not be baptized, vnlesse thou beleevest with all thy heart). *If thou beleevest thou maist, is not more exclusive: than if thou wilt thou canst.* Cōpare *Acts* 11. 17.

s. 16. That text of the people baptized by *Iohn* in *Iordan* confessing their sins *Mat:* 3. 6. is likewise answered by the *third instance*; so it was then, therefore so it must be still whether the accidents be alike or noe is a *non sequitur.* But for fuller answer to this argument and further evidence of the truth, I shall labour to make cleare. First *that the Baptisme administred by Iohn and Commanded by Christ, was one and the same. Secondly that Iohn did not require that actuall repentance, and Faith, which he urged in his Preaching, as essentially necessary to antecede Baptisme.* The former may be thus confirmed, the baptisme administred by *Iohn* had the same author, the same matter, the same forme, the same ends, and consigned the same Gospell and Gospell-administration with the Baptisme Commanded by Christ.

1. The Author was the same *Iohn* 1. 33.

Matt: 21: 25.

2. The matter the ſame *Iohn* 1: 26.

3. The forme the ſame *Iohn* 1. 32. 33. 34.

4. The ends the ſame *Luke*: 3 3.

5. The Goſpell & Goſpell-adminiſtration the ſame *Mar*: 1. 1. 3. 4.

The Law laſted only till Iohn *Luke* 16. 16. Chriſt & Iohn preached the ſame Doctrine of *repentance*, *Matt*: 3. 2. compared *Matt*: 10. 7. & *Luke* 10. 9 the ſame Doctrine of *Faith*, *Iohn* 1. 29. compared with *Reuel*: 13. 8. the Apoſtles therefore compute their Chriſtian Communion from Iohns baptiſme *Actes* 1. 21. 22. this identitie might alſo be vrged from *Ephes* 4. 4. 5. one baptiſme. And 1. *Cor* 12 13. baptized into one body.

s. 17. Againſt this poſition, the contrary-minded cōmonly object *Actes* 19. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. The clearing whereof is of no ſmall concernment againſt *rebaptization*. ℣ 1. *Paul* found *Diſciples* at Epheſus. *Diſciples* they were, & therefore Chriſtians *Actes* 11. 26 when Paul found them. His inqueſt is, have yee *receiued* the gift of the *Holy Ghoſt*, ſince yee beleived ℣. 2? not the *eſſence*, that is in-

finite,

finite, & incommunicable to a finite capacitie; not the *grace*, that was acknowledged even in the question *since yee believed*. But the *extraordinary and miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost*, stiled by Peter in the same phrase *Actes* 10.45.47. *the Holy Ghost*. Their answer is suitable to Pauls question: wee have not so much as heard whether there be any *Holy Ghost i. e. any such gift to be receiued by us, as Paul inquired off*. They had heard vndoubtedly off the Holy Ghost; for off the Holy Ghost and Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost, & the Spirit's descending on Christ visibly at baptisme, Iohn had preached *Iohn* 1.32.33. They had likewise probably heard of the Miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost. This miracle was publique, and the fame of it more publique, especially among Disciples, whose discourse is, what the Lord hath done for them. But they had not heard that themselves were inrighted to *receive* this gift. This answer therefore occasions another question; to what were yee then baptized? they replyed to Iohn's baptisme *v.* and thereon the Apostle argues *their right & title*

to receiue this gift of the Holy Ghost. And Luke relates *v.* 4. 5. what Paul *said*: & *v.* 6, what Paul *did*. First the scope & drift of Paul's Speech is to shew, *that those who were baptized with Iohns baptisme had right to receiue this gift*; as appeares both by the *occasion* antecedent, and *action* consequent to this discourse. The *medium*, whereby he proves it, is this; the baptisme administred by Iohn, & commanded by Christ, are *essentially* one & the same. The Disciples therefore, admitted by Iohn in baptisme, have equall priviledge with others, admitted by Christs commission. This he argues from the Doctrine which Iohn taught, in his preaching, and sealed by his baptisme. That Doctrine is declared *v.* 4. to be the pure Gospell conditions of repentance & faith, to be *in due time*, performed by them: and *v.* 5. they who heard this *i. e.* Iohn's Doctrine of repentance & faith on him, which should come after him, that is *Christ Iesus*; THESE were Baptized by Iohn's baptisme, *in the Name of the Lord Iesus*, whom Iohn thus Preached, & by whose commission, and to whose institutions

tutions Iohn baptized. *Paul* having finished this speech in the 4. & 5. *v* & thereby cleared the *title* of these disciples, baptized with Iohn's baptisme, to *receive* the gift of the holy Ghost. It is said expressely *v.* 6. *what Paul did, Sci* not when Paul baptized, (this was contrary to the whole scope of the place) but *when Paul lay'd his hands upon them the holy Ghost came upon them.* This Scripture therefore being rightly considered, is so farr from contradicting the first *position*, that it clearly confirmes it, *Sci* that Iohn baptized in the name of the Lord Iesus whom he preached. As the Apostle did likewise in the text. And consequently that the baptisme administred by Iohn & commanded by Christ, is essentially one & the same, Secondly it likewise confirmes the second *position*, *viz*: that Iohn did not require, that actuall faith and repentance, which he urged in his preaching, as essentially necessary to antecede Baptisme. Which truth I shall further make evident in both it's branches.

s. 18. First *not faith*, the identitie of *Iohns* baptisme with Christ's, hath already beene proved.

prooved. Iohn's baptiſme was therefore a New-Teſtament-Ordinance, and if faith was required as antecedent hereto, it muſt have beene ſuch a faith as the *New Teſtament* requires, which is not only in generall, (as under the former diſpenſation) that there ſhould be a *Meſſiah* and Salvation by him; but determined by a particular application, *to the perſon of Ieſus the Sonn of Mary as that Meſſiah*; and ſuch faith neither was, nor indeed could be antecedent to Iohn's baptiſme, Firſt it was not. For Iohn directed thoſe he baptized to beleeve on the Meſſiah, *as coming after him:* therefore not at that time exhibited to them, and to him not exhibited, their faith was not determined. Nor ſecondly could be: The Meſſiah could not thus be beleeved in, vntill firſt *manifeſted* to be that Meſſiah, and ſo Iohn could not manifeſt him, before he knew him; nor could that manifeſtatiõ antecede Iohn's Baptiſme, if it were one *end* why Iohn baptized, but Iohn adminiſtred baptiſme, before he knew that perſon explicitely to be the Meſſiah, & this was one end why he baptized; *that the Meſſiah*

Messiah might be made manifest to Israel Iohn 1. 31. 32. 33. And therefore that faith required in the new Testament dispensation was not required by Iohn as necessarily antecedent to Baptisme.

s. 19. Secondly not repentance *Matt:* 3: first *v:* 4. 11. Iohn is said to baptize εἰς μετάνοιαν *to repentance*. Repentance was one end of Iohn's Baptisme, and that the end of Iohn's Baptisme should antecede *perfectè et realiter*, what was in order to that end, implies a Contradiction, putting as it were the effect *in esse*, before the cause *in operari*. Secondly if such repentance as Peter prescribes did necessarily antecede Iohn's baptisme, he needed not to have preached repentance to those whom he had baptized. But it is observable that he preached this Doctrine not alone to those of the *Pharisees* whom he baptized *v:* 7. compared with the 11. but to the whole multitude who came forth to be baptized of him, and were accordingly baptized by him. *Luke* 3: 7: 8: 9. compared with *v:* 16.

Whereas it is said *Matt.* 3: 6. *that they confessed*

confeſſed their Sinns, firſt the meaning may be that by this *act* of baptization they confeſſed their filth, & need of ſpirituall purgation: and by this *initiatory conſignation* to another diſcipline, they confeſſed their legall obſervances, and externall privileges, abſtracted from Chriſt, to be of no efficacy; & ſo by *reall actions*, rather then verball expreſſions, confeſſed their ſinns: as it is ſaid *Leuit*: 16: 21. *that Auron by the ſcape Goate, & circumſtantiall ceremonies, confeſſed all the iniquities of the Children of Iſrael.* And as the Saints are ſaid by their good workes, and even Martyred Children by their ſufferings, to confeſſe Chriſt before Men. *Math*: 10. 32.

s. 17. And as the words in the text admit this ſence, ſo the nature of the thing confirmes it; for ſuppoſe this *confeſſion* to be *generall*, and then their act of ſubmiſſion to John's baptiſme (as conſigning remiſſion of ſinns, and in order thereto, that faith and repentance which he preached,) was æquivalent. And a generall verball confeſſion could not *really* ſuperadd, to that actuall acknowledgement; nor could ſuch confeſſion

produce

produce, any greater morall evidence of true faith and repentance than that act of submission for those ends. Or suppose this confession to be *particular*, then either it was made in private to *Iohn*; or in publique to the whole *assembly*. If in private to *Iohn*, then the *Papists* have hence some seeming plea, for *auricular* confession: but the *Anabaptists* none, for their practise if in publique to the whole *assembly*; it seemes contrary aswell to Christian *Charitie* as Christian *prudence*, and against rule, for disciples to be thus inforced *publiquely* to enumerate their private delinquencies; especially considering how many *Hypocrites* (rotten at the root) & how much chaffe (afterwards to be purg'd from the floore) did at that time frequent the baptisme of *Iohn*.

s. 20. Secondly Though such a confession had anteceded the participation of baptisme administred by *Iohn*; yet doth it not follow that true faith & repentance did antecede; for first that confession might be where *sinceritie* was not. The Skinnes of those Vipers might shine, and their Poyson lye

hid. Secondly though that confeſſion had bin ſincere, yet might it be only *preparative* to true repentance, like the *pricking* at the heart & complaint on the ſame of theſe *Iewes*, ſubſequently to which, the Apoſtle preſcribes *repent*. Thirdly, whatever confeſſion can be vnderſtood here, yet that the ſame is eſſentially neceſſarily & vniverſally required to antecede Baptiſme becauſe here practiſed, was made evident by the third inſtance to be a *non ſequitur*.

Theſe additionall anſwers to *Act*: 8: 36: 37. And *Math*: 3: I rather offer by way of diſquiſition then determination. That which I conceive to be fully ſatisfactory is delivered in the 3d inſtance and the reaſon of it vnfolded in the firſt propoſition of the fourth.

CHAP: III.

CHAP III.

Dipping not neceſſary to Baptiſme.

s. 1. THe ſecond duty preſcribed is *Baptiſme*. Wherein conſider, firſt the act enjoyned, *be baptized*. Secondly the ſubject recipient, illuſtrated by its adjunct vniuerſalitie in a note of diſtribution, *every one of you*. Thirdly the adjunct Authoritie, *in the Name of the Lord Ieſus*. Fourthly *objectum rei*, wherein is alſo implied the finall cauſe, *for the remiſſion of Sinns*.

s. 2. The act, *be baptized*. This phraſe connotates, firſt the element, *water*; *water* is a ſimilar body, each drop of water is water. There is nothing in this word determining to a river, or running ſtreame: If water proportionate to waſhing be uſed, that ſufficeth. Secondly the applicarion of this element;

waſhing. That the manner of this waſhing ſhould be neceſſarily *Dipping*, can neither be concluded from the ſignification of the word, nor from any other Scripture direction. Firſt not from the word. For baptiſme in generall ſignifies *waſhing*, without limiting the manner to dipping: thus *Mar*: 7: 4 The *Phariſees* eate not, except they *waſh*, & *Luke* 11: 38 the *Phariſees* marvailed at Chriſt, that he had not firſt *waſhed*. And this waſhing (us'd by the *Phariſees*) is deſcribed in the Iewiſh Antiquities to have beene by holding up their hands & powring water on them. The Iewes likewiſe *waſhed* their Tables Beds &c. (That is I conceive eſpecially thoſe Beds whereon they lay at their meate) not by carrying them out of their houſes, & dipping them in their rivers, but by powring water on them: yet is their act herein called Baptiſme. And when their Fathers are ſaid to be *baptized in the cloud*, it cannot ſignifie they were *dipped* in the cloude: though it may intimate that they were waſhed by it: 1 *Cor*: 1: 2.

s. 3. Secondly not from other Scripture direction,

direction, theſe texts are eſpecially cited. First *Iohn* 3: 23. *Iohn was baptizing in Aenon: for much water was there. Anſwer*, firſt becauſe much water was there, therefore neceſſarily perſons were then, and muſt be now, dipped is doubly inconſequent. *waſhing may be without dipping where much water is.* Secondly *Aenon* ſignifies a litle fountaine, & Geographers deſcribing the Land of *Canaan*, doe thus deſcribe it. Nigh unto *Salim* (not *Ieruſalem*, but that *Salim*, which was ſince called *Scythopolis*) *Iordan* brancheth forth into another *ſmall* river, which at firſt, ſpreading it ſelfe on that plaine in breadth, is very ſhallow. Though afterwards contracted into a narrow channell, it runs deeper into the *Mediterranean Sea*. But where it is thus ſpread, and thereby broad, is that *Aenon* ſcituated, Where *Iohn* baptized: and there the river is ſo ſhallow that it is not poſſible to dipp, or douſe over head & eares a little Child therein. *Iohn therefore cannot be conceiued to baptize here, in order to dipping. ſince the place is ſuch, as wherein perſons could not be dipped without ſome additionall artifice.*

s. 4. But what then is the reason of this expression, *much water was there?* and what is the reason of this inference, *Iohn baptized at Aenon, for much water was there. Answer* the expression in the Greek is ὕδατα πολλὰ many waters. And there may be two reasons given for the use of it. First one and many are oppos'd *relatiuely*, (as a measure and the thing thereby measured) & *per modum adiectionis*; number being nothing else but *multitude* measured by *vnites*. Whatsoever then hath this adjection of vnite, to vnite, that in number and opposition to one, is called *many*. The waters therefore may here, in this sense be termed plurally, because at this place, Iordan divides it selfe into more than one.. Secondly the Writers of the *New-Testament* in their phrase imitate the 70: in the old, and the 70: frequently use πολλὴ in the translation of רְחָבָה *large & broad:* thus *Exod:* 3: 8: and so may it be used in this text *many waters i: e: broad, not deepe waters, were there.* These two interpretations of this phrase, *many waters*, are not only warranted by the use of the words in the like sense, but

by

by all Geographicall deſcriptions of *Aenon*, whereas that other (by much water vnderſtanding depth of water) is contradictory to all ſuch deſcriptions: And the truth it ſelfe, for the waters at *Aenon* are not deepe.

s. 5. The reaſon of the inference, why *Iohn* baptizd at *Aenon*, *becauſe of theſe many waters there*, may probably be this. *Iohn* having baptized at *Bethabara Iohn* 1: 28. (which was the moſt frequent paſſage over *Iordan Iudg*: 7: 24:) in regard of the great concourſe uſually there, that his doctrine & baptiſme might be promulgated, & having initiated many Diſciples, and other multitudes dayly flocking to him, he choſe rather to performe this duty at *Aenon* than any longer at *Bethabara*; becauſe at *Aenon* (the water ſpreading in a larger plaine) the multitude of his Diſciples might better heare his Sermons, and ſee his adminiſtration of baptiſme, than if performed under the ſhading bankes of *Iordan*. This reaſon of the inference is cleare, whereas the other aſſigned from the depth of the waters (ſuppoſing that depth at *Aenon*) ſeemes very vnreaſonable,

in

in regard an adjunct, equally common to diverse subjects, cannot be the formall reason of the wills determining it selfe, to one of those subjects. Is it sense, that *Iohn* should leave *Bethabara* (where 'tis certaine much water was) to baptize at *Aenon*, on this sole accompt & motiue, *because much water was there?* and is it not more probable that *Iohn* baptizing in this shallow (though broad) branch of *Iordan*, did (taking up water in his hands) power it on them, than any thing that as yet hath beene vrged, for dipping any of them?

s. 6. Another Scripture is *Actes* 8: 38: 39 *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went both downe into the water, and came up out of the water. *Answer* First the Greeke is, *they went both downe to the water*, and *they came up from the water*. Which phrase may possibly signifie the ascents, & descents of the tendencie, or way. Secondly though both of them had gone into the water, yet is it no demonstration, that either of them was *Dipped* in the water. Thirdly this phrase is equally applied to *both*, if then it signifies the *Dipping* of either

either it equally signifies the dipping of *both*, the baptizer aswell as the baptized, fourthly to dipp this *Eunuch Naked*, had beene vnsuitable to *Christian modesty*, and with his *Cloaths* on, vnsuitable to his travailing condition: so farr therefore is this instance from prooving a *necessity of Dipping*, that it affords a probable argument, of the contrary, *Sci* that *Philip* baptized the *Eunuch by powring water* on him.

s. 7. A third Scripture is *Rom* 6: 4: wee are buried with Christ in baptisme. *Answ*: first in buriall earth is cast upon the corps interred. And therefore this *Analogie*, is as fully answered by *powring on*, as by dipping in. *Symbolicall Scriptures are not argumentative.*

s. 8. I doe not say that *simplie* in baptisme, dippings unlawfull. I only say 'tis not *essentiall*; & therefore may be circumstantiated, with such inconveniencies, as may render it vnlawfull: *Sci* the *tempting* of God by the voluntary vnnecessary hazard of health, life in these *colder* climates. I doe not deny but it is probable that the primitive Saints did in those *hotter* Countries somtimes use dipp-

ing, but I doe affirme at other times, it is no leſſe probable that they *Baptiz'd without Dipping*.

s. 9. Thoſe 3000 added to the *Church*, in this Chapter, could not with probable ſecuritie, vnder that perſecuting power, reſort to the River *openly*, & in ſuch a multitude. Nor poſſibly after that manner (pleaded for) be baptized in one day. The Iaylor alſo and his whole houſe *Actes 16:33* were *ſtraight way* baptized: yet their paſſage to a River or other meanes of dipping not mentioned, not intimated, and ſurely *Paul* after his ſuffering thoſe many ſtripes the Euening before *v 23* was very vnfit for this action in this way of dipping.

CHAP. IIII.

The Commiſsion for Baptiſme, includes ſome Infants.

s. 1. THe Second generall obſerved, concerning the 2d duty in this text required is *the ſubject ſuſcipient* ἕκαστος ὑμῶν *euery one of you*. As *Lidia's* attention is expreſſed ſingly *Act:* 16: 14 15. She attended to the things which *Paul* ſpoake but her baptiſme joyntly with her relatiues, *She was baptized and her Houſehold*. So in the text the firſt duty *Repent ye*, & the firſt privilege *Ye ſhall receiue the gift of the Holy Ghoſt* Seemes more reſtrained. But the 2 duty *be baptized euery one of you*, and the 2 privilege *the promiſe is to you and your Children* Seemes more inlarged. As there is not one jot of Gods word in vaine, ſo not a varietie without ſome Emphaſis.

s. 2. This phraſe Every one of you is *vniuerſall*, and comprehends in the latitude of it's ſignification *Children*, aſwell as Men & Women; the reſtraining it therefore to the excluſion of Children, is a ſubſtraction from the Scripture, vnleſſe the ſubjected matter doth ſo reſtraine it. For clearing whereof let us conſider the perſons to whome, with the end for which, & the ground on which, the Apoſtle preſſeth this exhortation.

s. 3. Firſt. The perſons exhorted were the *Iewes*, & firſt I preſume it will not be denied, that the *Iewes* uſed *baptiſme* in admitting *proſelytes* Men Women & Children, probably reſpecting Gods choice of water to purge the old worlds iniquitie, in regard the *proſelytes* of the gate (who were only obliged to the 7 precepts of *Noah*) were baptized only. Yea now the *Iewes* baptize *Mahumetane* converts.

s. 4. Secondly I preſume it will not be denied that the *Iewiſh Rabbins* held this propheticall tradition, that *the Meſſiah ſhould admitt proſelytes Men VVomen and Children by baptiſme*, which might be the Reaſon why the *Iewes* queſtiõ not *Iohn* cõcerning his act

of

of baptizing, but his Authority. *Iohn* 1:25.

s. 5. Thirdly I presume that though *Christ's* commission hath furnished baptisme with a new grace, and appointed it to higher ends & purposes, yet noe alteration of the outward act of the *Iewish* initiatorie baptisme is even therein implied, much lesse expressed. *Since then the Iewes held, as well by their practise, as tradition to baptize the infants of proselytes, and since the Commission of Christ altered not the outward act of their baptisme.* The consideration of the persons exhorted, confutes the restraining of this vniversall to the exclusion of Children.

s. 6. Secondly, The end for which, *viz. remission of sinns i. e.* Covenant-blessings, & the ground on which, *viz. The promise i. e.* Covenant interest, extends to Children, as well as Men and Women; & therefore confirmes the exposition of this vniversall as inclusive of Children.

The Argument.

Some Children are included in this exhortation to baptisme, *Ergo* some Children ought to be baptized. See *P.* 15.

s. 7.

s. 7. The third generall observed, concerning the 2 duty, is the adjunct Authoritie *in the Name of Iesus i. e.* by Commission from *Iesus*. This Commission is inrouled *Mat* 28. 19 *disciplize all Nations baptizing them*. First *Nations*. The dispensation is nationall, and *from a nationall dispensatiõ noe intire species euer was exempted*. The cõmission (for this dispensation) is to the execution of that Gospell promise *Gen.* 12. 3. & 18. 18. & 22. 18. *That* is nationall, therefore soe *this*; & as Children are not exempted from that, so neither ought they to be exempted from this. They are a great and distinct part of each Nation.

s. 8. Secondly *all Nations* in opposition to that *one Nation* of the *Iewes*, to whom their former Cõmission was limited, *Euery Nation* therefore (so farr as *disciplized*) is by this Commission, as much inrighted to all the substantiall privileges of the Covenant of grace, as the *Iewish Nation* was formerly. the Parents and their Children then; the Parents and their Children now.

s. 9. Thirdly *Discipulize*. Discipleship signifies, either *Metonymically* that inward qualification,

qualification; which is the reall fruit and effect of instruction; or *properly* an externall relation to some Instructor. In the former sense (I confesse) it is vsed *Luke*: 14. 26 & such are called Christs Disciples ἀληθῶς *indeed*. *Iohn* 8: 31: in contradistinctiō to others, who are only so *relatively*. But that discipleship signifies properly an outward relatiō without cōnotating necessarily the inward qualifications of the relative subject. May appeare by considering, first some expressions *Analogicall*. Either to be one of Christ's externally *Mat*: 26: 57. *Mar*: 14: 17 to be with Christ externally, *Luke* 22: 59, beares the same sense with being one of Christ's Disciples *Iohn* 18. 17. 25. Or the Evangelists differ in sense in declaring the same passage. And either *Discipleship* here signifies the externall relation of *Peter* to Christ, or those persons who vs'd those expressions could not have urg'd the same against *Peter*: his Inward grace was neither subject to their accusation nor sentēce any further then as expressed *Sub signo externo*. *Actes* 11. 26. Either to be a *Christian*, Or relating to Christ signifies the same

with

with being his *Disciple*, or the name of Christian is not peculiarly distinctive to difference Christ's *Disciples* from all others. Compare likewise *Mar*: 9: 41 with *Mat*: 10. 42. Secondly some expressions *paralell*; those who related to *Moses* are called *Moses's Disciples Iohn* 9. 28. Those who related to *Iohn*, *Iohn's Disciples*, those who related to the Pharisees *the Pharisees Disciples Mar*: 2. 18, & so those who externally related to *Christ Christ's Disciples*. *Iudas* was one of the 12 *Disciples Mat*. 10: 1. Those who left Christ were Disciples *Iohn* 6. 66. And Disciples drawne away *Actes* 20. 30: yet all these were no more then externally *relatives*. The word in the text signifies not strictly such only as are truly *gratious*: for first in that sense no Minister could in faith Baptize any Person, *see P.* 9. 10. Secondly in that sense the Apostles had acted contrary to their Commission in Baptizing such *Iohn* 4: 1: 2 as fell away *Iohn* 6. 66. And in Baptizing *Simon Magus Actes* 8. 13. 21. Thirdly neither the word it selfe nor any thing else here, nor any other place of Scripture restraines this cōmission to that sense.

sense. But the word here signifies largely *all relatiues to the Schoole of Christ*, though they be such only externally, and however they were made, or came to be such, whither by a *Parentall right*, as the *Iewes* Children were called *Moses Disciples*, and as the Children of Christians are *Christs Disciples*: or by personall instruction, as Gentiles proselyted among the *Iewes*, and *Infidells* converted to this relative state among Christians. That μαθητευειν signifies the *being* of this relation, without determining the *making* to this or that way, may be collected from *Mat*: 27. 57. where wee rightly translate it by *sum*, & herein it answers that *Arabinick* phrase of עשה תלמידים to make Disciples generally *by way of admission*, & differs from למד תלמידים to make Disciples particularly *by way of Instruction*.

s. 11. This externall relation intitles to externall Baptisme, & as wee cannot have any certaine evidence of the true grace of Children, so neither of Men, whose professions may be Hypocriticall: but as we may have evidence of some Men's, so may wee

likewiſe of ſome Children's relation to Chriſt as Diſciples. Accordingly in Scripture *both the thing ſignified by Diſciples, and Name of Diſciples, is giuen to ſome Children.* Firſt the thing ſignified: a litle child may be receiued in Chriſts name *Mar:* 9. 36. 37, *i. e.* becauſe belonging to Chriſt *v.* 41, and that is analogicall to receiving him in the name of a Diſciple. Secondly the Name Diſciple *Act:* 15. The falſe teachers would have impoſed the yoke of circumciſion on the neck of the Diſciples *v.* 10, after the manner of *Moſes v.* 1, therefore on the *Children* aſwell as men, for ſo *Moſes* commanded *Leuit:* 12. 3. Either then *Children* are here called *Diſciples* or *Peters reproofe* is not proportionate to their ſin, ſo that notwithſtanding any thing that *Peter* had ſaid the *Children* might have bin circumciſed, without tempting God. Add that the Moderne *Iewes* doe ordinarily circumciſe their Children in their *Schooles*, to ſignifie they relate thereto, and are (eyen in that age) *Moſes Diſciples*. If then both the name Diſciple, & thing ſignified by Diſciple, belongs to ſome children, ſome Children are Chriſt's

Diſciples

Disciples, and consequently not excluded from baptisme by this Commission.

s. 12. For further clearing hereof, First distinguish the grant of the *Donor*, from the receptibilitie of the *Donee*. The *Donor's grant* (if national) exempts not any intire *species*, S. 7. yet through *incapabilitie* in the Donee, every *species* may not in all instances be regularly *receptive* thereof. Are *children* then capable of the *national* grant in this commission? Observe, no *act* is required of, nor *command* given to the *baptizand*: but to the Baptizer *authoritie*, to baptize Disciples, *i.e.* relatives to Christ's schoul. And though *children* are uncapable of *learning*, yet not of *relating* to Christ, though of *acting*, yet others may *act* about them, *baptize them*.

s. 13. Secondly, observe the first *institution* of baptisme precisely respected the *Jews*, John 4. 1. with *Matth.* 10. 5, 6. The *covenant* therefore sealed to *all nations* by baptisme is *that* (essentially) made with the *Jews*: & the *Ordinance* as practised among the *Jews* is by this *indefinite* command applied to *all nations*, *and both that covenant and practise included children*.

The Argument.

If neither Christ's *commission*, nor receptive

incapacitie exclude the *children* of Christians from *Baptisme*, They ought not to be excluded But neither excludes them. Therefore, *&c.*

No exclusion in Christ's *commission*, for that is *National* and indefinite; no *incapacitie* in the children of Christians; To *receive*, a passivitie is sufficient: to *qualifie*, an external *relation* of incompleat Discipleship, to be compleated by baptisme. Of the first, *all children*: of the second, the *children of Christians* are undoubtedly *capable*

Chap. V.

Baptismal ends intitle some Children to Baptisme.

§. 1. The Fourth general observed concerning the Second dutie, is *objectum rei* wherein is also implied, the final cause *to the remission of sins*; i. e. *Synecdochically* to all covenant-blessings (as visibly administered) whereunto circumcision did, *Rom.* 4. 11. and baptisme doth, solemnly consigne the subfœderates. On the Covenant-terms, and by the Covenant-virtue these blessings are as well the ends as effects of baptisme, which if seriously meditated and powerfully experienced would put an end to this controversie. Interrogate any of the Anabaptist-

nabaptiſt-way, for what *proper ends* God appointed this ordinance? and (if rightly aſſigned & by Scripture prooved) you will eaſily diſcover that infancie excludes not from theſe *ends*, nor conſequently from this inſtituted *medium*. If there be no proper end, in order to which God ordained this Sacrament, why turne they not *Seekers*? if there be what is it? and what renders infants vncapable of it? I ſhall ſummarily at preſent expreſſe my apprehenſions in this particular, intending ſuddainly (through the Lords grace) either in the Pulpit, or at the Preſſe a more Large diſcourſe, concerning the doctrine of the Covenant of grace, the externall adminiſtration of that covenant, & the ſpirituall *energie* of that adminiſtration.

s. 2. The Covenant-ends and effects of Baptiſme pertaine to the whole life of a Chriſtian, & every ſtate of it, and (according to its generall Sacramentall nature) may be conſidered vnder theſe 3 *relations*. Firſt as it is a *ſigne*, ſecondly as it is a *Seale*, Thirdly as it is an *inſtrument*. The two firſt are cõmon to all the baptized, the laſt proper to the elect.

lect. Firſt as baptiſme is a *ſigne*, *ſignum diſcretivum*, the ends are, to marke the perſon baptized for God, diſtinguiſh him from the world, (*teſſera militaris*) declare him to belong to Chriſt's Army, *de facto* adopt him into Chriſt's family, & intereſſe him in the prayers & bleſſings of the Lords people. In reſpect of theſe ends we are all ſaid to baptized into one body 1 *Cor*: 12. 13. And Of theſe ends ſome Children are capable. Are not the Parents & their Children joyned in the ſame relation of Servants *Leu*: 25. 41. 42?

s. 3. Secondly as baptſme is a Seale, the proper end of it is, *mutuall ingaging*; it aſſures us of God's worke, obliegeth us to ours. We are ingaged in baptiſme to performe our duty, God ingaged therein to performe his promiſe. Which two (duty & promiſe) are the eſſentiall partes of the Covenant ſealed by baptiſme. That ynnſuall expreſſion, 1 *Peter* 3. 21. May be interpreted either way εωτηματα the *anſwerableneſſe* or correſpondencie of a good Conſcience, according to our duty: or the *anſwer of Peace*, and teſtimoniall of Gods wellpleaſingneſſe in baptiſme, according

ing

ing to his promiſe. To the like purpoſe is *Gal.* 3. 27: As many of you as have beene baptized into Chriſt have put on Chriſt. *i. e.* not vniuerſally *ſpiritually*, for then there had beene no cauſe for his feare leſt he had beſtowed his labour in vaine. *C.* 4. 11. But vniverſally *Sacramentally*, denoting God's Covenant promiſe ingaged at Baptiſme *to put Chriſt on us*: and our Covenant duty ingaged at Baptiſme *to put on Chriſt*. Thus *Rom:* 6. 3. 4. 5. Our being implanted into the likeneſſe of Chriſt's death *i. e.* in mortification, or dying to ſinn, and into the likenes of Chriſt's reſurrection *i. e.* in vivification, or living to righteouſnes, may (I conceive) be vnderſtood of God's ingagement to us, in Baptiſme, to vouchſafe us theſe graces; & our ingagement to God to performe theſe dutys. Let us therefore conſider both theſe ingagements diſtinctly.

s. 4. Firſt God ingageth in baptiſme, and ſealeth his promiſe: but here weemuſt diſtinguiſh betweene the promiſe in it ſelfe, and *intereſſe meum* my right and intereſt. God in baptiſme ſeales *abſolutely* the truth

truth of his promiſe, But only *conditionally* my right and intereſt *i. e.* upon condition that I performe the condition; of the former is baptiſme a ſeale *primarily*, and but *ſecundarily* of the later. In regard of this common Sacramentall virtue, Circumciſion, is called a *ſeale Rom:* 4. 11. & the conſequence is good *a quatenus ad de omni.* As therefore the *ſpirit* inwardly, ſo outwardly *blood* in the Lords Supper, and *water* in Baptiſme are ſaid *to beare record, i. e.* to ſeale on *Earth*, and to *agree in one i. e.* to be for one ſealing end & purpoſe, 1. *Iohn* 5. 8. of this end of Baptiſme ſome Children are capable, *If God be not ingaged to any by promiſe there is no ground to hope the Salvation of any, and if God be ſo ingaged to ſome, there is no incapacitie, but that ingagement may be ſealed by Baptiſme.*

s. 5. Secondly we ingage in Baptiſme and ſeale to our duty, when the Apoſtle ſayes 1. *Cor:* 1. 13. Were yee baptized *into* the *name* of *Paul?* the meaning is, were ye by baptiſme ingaged to *Paul's* Service? in like kind when we are ſaid to be baptized *into* the *name* of the Father Son and Holy Ghoſt. *Mat:* 28. 19.

It

it may be expounded, *to* the Service of the Father &c. the particle בְּ *in* may especially respect the authoritie, but לְ *to* respecteth especially this end of baptisme, or baptismall ingagement, or rather both of them connotate both of these. Of this end of baptisme children are capable; though personally they ingage not, yet they may be ingaged. The Parent may come to the Lord and say. Lord thou hast given this Child to me, Lord I desire to give it back againe to thee, and by my Parentall authoritie ingage this Child to owne the Lord for his God and follow him. First, This authoritie derives from the Law of nature, in Leases and Covenants with Men none dispute it's exercise, yet the principall end and purpose of God in granting this authoritie to parents is spirituall, much more then may a parent ingage his Child to Keepe Covenant with God. Secondly This authoritie was exercised in the *Iewish Oeconomie Deut:* 29. 10. 11. The little ones *borne* are with their Parents ingaged *actually*: and *unborne* v 15, Ingaged *intentionally*. Either therefore a Parents authoritie over his child

is not ſo *great*, as formerly: or God is not ſo *willing* to have children ingaged to him as formerly: or Parents have Authoritie thus to ingage their children now, and children are capable of this ingagement now, as formerly. Note here, in this ingagement the Parent promiſeth not abſolutely *de eventu* what ſhall be, but *de debito* what ought to be, and this ingagement doth not cauſe that to be a duty in the child, which otherwiſe was not, but cauſeth a further additionall obligation to that duty, which was.

s. 6. Thirdly as Baptiſme is an *inſtrument*, the end thereof is *to convey grace*. That there is *Grace* Baptiſmall; That this Grace is that *gift* or *favour* which God vouchſafeth at Baptiſme, is generally determined. But how Baptiſme is an inſtrument of conveyance, and what this baptiſmall Grace conveyed is, are not ſo generally defined. At preſent I ſhall only give you a *breviate* of my apprehenſions herein.

s. 7. Firſt an inſtrument is either *Phyſicall*, or *morall*. A Phyſicall *inſtrument* by an activitie derived from the principall *Agent*, is

is causatiue of the effect. A morall instrumēt is such, as whereto the effect is *imputed*, as an occasion, or condition thereof, though it doth not properly effect. Baptisme neither is nor can possibly be a *Physicall instrument* of grace, in regard it is not capable of receiving (and therefore not of *Physicall conveying*) any such virtue from the *principall Agent*. But a *morrall instrument* (I conceiue) it is of baptismall grace, *i. e.* It consists of such acts of *duty & worship*, as the Lord by a Divine *cōcomitance* (according to his good pleasure) furnishes, & accompanies with spirituall gratious *effects*. That as upon the *Token* of thy Freind, a summ of mony is payed to thee; so upon this *Token* of thy God, baptismall grace is conveyed, yet so, as by *God*: though therefore the *vse* of the *Ordinance* is in our Hands: yet the *effect* is in God's, who dispenseth the same to whom, and in what degree he pleaseth.

s. 8. Secondly Baptismall *grace* is, not one single grace, but a *complexion* (as I may so speake) of *grace*. First *insition* or implantation into Christ *i. e.* a reall actuall spirituall

relation, by which wee are made *one* with Chriſt, and Chriſt made *one* with us *Rom:* 6: 3: 5.

s. 9. Secondly, *Regeneration* in the *firſt* act, or the ſeed of God 1 *Iohn* 3: 9: the *ſpirit* of faith 2 *Cor:* 4. 13 the *Divine nature* 2 *Pet:* 1. 4. This is commonly called the *Habit* of grace, in diſtinction from the *exerciſe* of grace; otherwiſe the terme is improper, for *Habits* only facilitate the *powers* in acting; but this grace is the *firſt principle* of acting; and though it produceth noe *new faculties* in the Soule, yet it ſpiritually inlivens & actuates the regenerate ſoule, in all its faculties & powers, as the ſoule by it's vnion with the Bodie, inlieneth the naturall members, but ſuperadds not any new to the bodie. That this grace is baptiſmall (I conceive) declared *Col:* 2: 12: *Tit:* 3: 5. cõpared with *Io:* 3. 5. This laſt text is by the *Antients* generally interpreted to attribute cleerly *Regeneration* to baptiſme (as it's ordinarie inſtrument) but by many *moderne* Holy & learned otherwiſe expounded; I humbly offer to diſquiſitiõ. Firſt whether any *neceſſitie* can be

inſtanced

instanced pressing a departure from the *grammatical* sense of water in this text, to an *allegoricall*? Secondly if without *necessitie* the *grammaticall* sense be declined, though the words in other places bear other senses, whether such interpretation be not rather *brought* to the text than *found* in it? Thirdly, whether it be not the *scope* of our Saviour in this text, to direct *Nicodemus* in the ordinarie road to Salvation? and whether as the workings of the spirit *inwardly*, so the Ordinances *outwardly*, be not this road? Fourthly whether an expression meerly *exegeticall* be vsually antecedent in Scripture, as the mention of *water* is here before the *spirit*?

Ob. If baptisme be *regenerative*, why is't not indiscriminately administer'd to *all*, as the *word* preached? *Answer* in these degrees; first God appoints his *ordinances* (not onely as duties to us, but) as *meanes* destinated by grace to spirituall *ends*, and *effects*. Secondly, These *ends* of each ordinance are *many*, and *diverse*. Thirdly, though no *minister* can in faith apply any ordinance to *any*, *not visibly inrighted to any ends* of that ordinance; yet he may to some visibly inrighted, only to *some*. Fourthly, to some *ends* of Preaching (as common restraining grace, knowledge, *&c.*) *all persons* are visibly inright-

ed; therefore, to *all* may the Goſpel be preached. But Fifthly, to no *end* of baptiſme is any viſibly inrighted except viſible Church and covenant-relatives; therefore *to none* but *ſuch is baptiſme to be adminiſtered.*

s. 10. Thirdly, *Iuſtification (that is)* actual remiſſion of ſins paſt, and admiſſion to a regular ſtate of pardon on the Covenant-conditions for ſins future, *Acts* 22. 26. *Luke* 3. 3.

s. 11. Fourthly, *adoption* (not only the *external* cõmon to all the baptized, S. 12. but) the *internal*, peculiar to the elect, implied in the former, and the reaſon of its attribution, *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28, 29.

s. 12. Fifthly, *Salvation*, *Tit.* 3. 5. 1. *Pet.* 3. 21.

s. 13. Concerning theſe baptiſmal ends read and meditate, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5, 6. for though the *ſcope* of that place ſeems principally to intend *baptiſmal ingagement*, yet not *excluſively*; yea rather all the particularized *baptiſmal graces* of union, regeneration, juſtification, adoption, & ſalvation are ſummarily comprized therein, & may be further cleared thereby in your private meditations, for your aſſiſtance wherein, and further manifeſtatiõ of this Doctrine, I offer to your conſideration theſe Corollaries. Firſt, the graces vouchſafed by God to us ſõetimes denote the *firſt* act, ſometimes the *compleat act* when they

they are assigned as the *proper ends* of baptisme, wee are to vnderstand them in the first sense.

s. 14. Secondly, when these gratious effects are attributed to baptisme, the outward element of *Water* is not considered *separately* from the inward worke of the Spirit, but *conjunctly* with it, and *subordinately* to it. Noe more therefore is attributed hereby to this Ordinance, than God gives it, or than is confessed by the contrary-minded to be given to the preaching of the word *viz a morall Instrumentality.*

s. 15. Thirdly, though baptisme be such an *instrument*, yet it profits not *ex opere operato*, but *mediante Gratiâ* (in receipt of which *first Grace* we are purely passive) As though the word be the *instrument of faith Rom:* 10. 7. Yet it profits not, vnlesse mingled with *faith* in them that heare it *Heb:* 4. 2.

s. 16. Fourthly, though in a Church constituted, the Lord ordinarily vseth baptisme to convey these *seminall blessings*: yet is not his grace so chained to this Ordinance, but that he can worke without it, & accordingly

ingly doth so; in those who (though belonging to his Covenant-promise) are deprived of baptisme, without their default. As though ordinarily preaching the word be the meanes of *converting grace*, and the Lords Supper of *cherishing grace*; yet is not *God's grace* absolutely tied to the one, or to the other.

s. 17. Fifthly, though all the præcited blessings may be called *baptismall*, because ordinarily to such, members of a Church constituted, as belongs to the election of grace, vouchsafed in baptisme: Yet are the communications hereof suited to the wants of the *suscipients*, when therefore the Lord hath wrought any of these graces before the application of baptisme, then baptisme only serves to convey the rest. *Warmth & ornament* are the ends of garments, though those who are already warme, use them not to this end to make them warme. *It is not necessary that the suscipient of Baptisme should either need, or be capable of all it's ends, in that instance wherein that Ordinance is administred.*

s. 18. Sixthly, baptismall virtue in conveying these graces is not to be limited to a-

ny

by one period of life; but it's influxes are transmitted, *as sap and juyce* from the roote to every branch. Wee are therefore said by our buriall with Christ in Baptisme to put off the body of the sins of the flesh *Col.* 2. 11. 12. And to be buried by baptisme into Christ's Death that we should walke in newnes of Life *Rom.* 6. 3. 4. which are the summaries of *mortification*, or dying to sinne: and *vivification* or Living to God, and comprize the duties of our whole Life.

s. 19. Seuenthly, Seminall grace is (as it were) *actus primus*, conversion *actus secundus*: *that* denotes renewall *passiuely*, *this* an *actiue* mooving towards God, in the *exercise* of grace: as therefore the fruites of *originall sinne*, so the fruites of *seminall grace*, may not appeare in some many yeares, and consequently their conversion (properly) be long after baptisme.

s. 20. Eightly, in some naturall Fooles and Madmen there appeare not any fruits of *reason*, or *grace*, throughout the whole course of their lives: yet would it be folly & madnes to condemne the soules of all such, as

void of *reason* to the state of *beasts*, or as void of *grace* to the state of Divills. And if it be not derogatorie to the glory of the *Lords grace & workemanship* that neither *reason* nor *grace* should be *exercised in such*, why should it be thought derogatorie to the Lords glory that *seminall grace* should be vouchsafed many yeares *to others* before the *exercise* of it? Yea is it not lesse derogatory to delay the *appearance* though the seed be *sowen*, than to delay the *seed* though *proper* to the ground i. e. though the person be *praelected*? Since those appearances of grace are only necessarie to salvation *secundum quid*, but the new principle or seminall grace is *absolutely & essentially* necessarie, no salvation of any without it *Ioh.* 3. 5. Lastly are not the *exercise* of some graces deferred by God, in most of his Servants, till many yeares after *conversion*? and if so, why may he not, without injury to his grace, deferr the *exercise* of all many yeares after Baptisme?

Though the Lords wayes of communicating himselfe and his graces to Children are very hidden, because as knowledge

by acquisition is *ab effectu*, and the effects of grace appeare not in Children: so knowledge by revelation is circumscribed to *Scripture discoveries*, & those discoveries concerne Men especially, to whom they were penned, as a rule & Cannon: yet that *Children specifically considered* have right to, & are capable of the præmised baptismall graces, is beyond dispute evident. First, for *implantation* into Christ, either all Children are damned: or some so *implanted*; for without it there can be no life 1 *Iohn* 5. 12. this may be exemplified in the election of *Iacob* Rom. 9. 11. compared with *Eph:* 1. 4.

s. 22. Secondly, for *Regeneration*, either some Children are regenerated: or no Children can enter into the Kingdome of Heaven; for aswell the tenor of our Saviours words *Iohn* 3. 5. as the subjoyned reason v. 6 includeth Children; & whereas the principall efficient of this grace is the *spirit*, the capacitie of Children to receive this *spirit* is exemplified in *Iohn*, who was filled with the *Holy Ghost* even from his Mothers Wombe *Luke* 1. 15. Nor is it importune to observe

here that Christ requires adult beleevers to become as little Children *Mat:* 18. 3. and if grace were not verified in them, they could not be made such *patternes* to others; Wherefore *v.* 6 they are expressely said to beleeve in Christ, and inhibition given to whatsoever may *offend* them; *i. e. ratione potentiæ* what in it's owne nature, & *potentially* might tend to their *offence*, or hinderance in their way to Heaven, the word is thus used *Mat:* 16. 23. It was more impossible that *Peter* should *Scandalize* Christ actually: than that any Children should be so *scandalized*; the word therefore in both places denotes *scandall potentiall*.

s. 23. Thirdly, for *Justification*; either some Children are made righteous by the obedience of the *second Adam*: or all Children are damned for the disobedience of the *first Rom:* 5. 14. but the *Justification* of some Children may not only be collected necessarily from the former graces, but exemplified in *Ieroboams* Child 1 *Kings* 14. 13.

s. 24. Fourthly, *Adoption Gal:* 3. 28. 29. compared with C. 4 *v:* 4. 5. God is in Christ

a

a *Covenant-God* to some Children, and therefore to some Children likewise a *Covenant-Father*.

s. 25. Fifthly, for *Salvation* read *Mat:* 18. 10. there Angells behold the face of God & *v* 14: it is *not* the Fathers will they should *perish*. *Rev:* 20. 12. *Small* as well as Great are written in the booke of *Life*. *David* was confident that his Child was gone whither he should goe also *i. e.* to *Heaven*; & thereon comforted himselfe at his childs death 1 *Sam:* 12. 23.

s. 26. Thus I have shewen you what (I conceive) to be the ends of baptisme, and the right and capabilitie which Children, *specifically* considered, have to the same. Among these ends I have not inserted that which some account the cheife end thereof, viz. that it should be *demonstratively significant of inward grace*; because I apprehend the *significant Analogie* is rather an *adjunct*, than end of baptisme; at most it is but a common, not a proper *end*, and of the proper ends I have beene treating. The discovery of which ends discovers also divers arguments, to confirme this truth, *that some Infants ought*

to

to be Baptized.

The Arguments.

First, all thoſe who as within the Church ought to be *diſtinguiſhed* from thoſe who are without, ought to be baptized; but ſome *Children* as within the Church ought to be *diſtinguiſhed* from thoſe who are without: therefore ſome *Children* ought to be Baptized.

Secondly, all thoſe to whom the Lord is *ingaged* by Covenant-promiſe, ought to be admitted to *baptiſme* the firſt *ſeale* of that Covenant-ingagement, & promiſe; but to ſome *Children* God is *ingaged* by Covenant-promiſe; therefore ſome *Children* ought to be admitted to *baptiſme*, the firſt *ſeale* of that Covenant-ingagement, & promiſe.

Thirdly, all thoſe who are *actually capable*, of being *ingaged* to the Lords *ſeruice*, are capable of being *baptized*, but ſome *Children* are *actually capable* of being *ingaged* to the Lords *ſeruice*; therefore ſome *Children* are capable of being *baptized*.

Fourthly, all thoſe who have *right* to, and are *capable* of *baptiſmall* graces & bleſſings, ought

ought to be *baptized*, vnlesse they be *secluded*, by some particular *exception*; but some *Children* have right to and are capable of *baptismall* graces, and blessings, and are not *secluded* by any particular exception; *therefore* some *Children* ought to be *baptized*.

The *Major* of each of these arguments, is inforced by the rule of *Iustice*, *Charity*, & *Religion* intitling them to the meanes, to whom the ends appertaine.

The (*Minor*) of each of these arguments, is cleered by the foregoing discourse, concerning the *ends* of baptisme, and the right of some Children to those *ends*.

The *Conclusion* therefore necessarily followes, *that some Children ought to be baptized*.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. IV.

Scripturall disputings are Logicall.

S. 1. BAptiſme in the text is aſwell *commended*, as *commanded*: commanded in a way of *duty*, commended in a way of *privilege*. Of the *duty* I have ſpoake, of the *priuileges* I am next to ſpeake. Theſe *priuileges* are either future or preſent. *Future*, ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt *i. e.* the extraordinarie miraculous gift of ſpeaking with Tongues &c. this *priuilege* is propounded as *future*, becauſe though the Lord ſometimes conferred it *before*, ſometimes *at* Baptiſme, yet ordinarily he vouchſafed this gift at *confirmation*, or impoſition of hands. *Adam* was immediately created by God, but *Mankind* propagated from him in the ordinarie way of generation.

on. The *Israelites* were fed in the wildernes with *Manna*, but having possessed the Land of *Canaan*, they must Plough & Sow. In like sort though the Lord vouchsafed the miraculous gift of his spirit to the *infant Church*, yet he deales otherwise with the *adult*. And in regard that dispensation of these extraordinarie gifts is ceased, I shall likewise cease further to discourse thereof at this present. And proceed to consider the 2d privilege, *viz.* Covenant interest, which the Apostle layeth as the *ground* of baptisme, and *by which Logically inforceth this exhortation to Baptisme.* Be baptized every one of you, *for* the promise is to you, & your Children &c.

s. 2. In my Letter to *Doct: Harding* of May the fourth 1653. (in order to a regular debate of infants baptisme) one proposition is, *That when any text of Scripture cited doth not expressly conclude that for which it is cited, the arguments may Logically thence be deduced.* Against this way of arguing (desired in that letter by me, & at the late publique conference by others of my Brethren,) *Doctor Harding* declaimes as *anti-scripturall*, & hath

accordingly thought fit to censure publiquely those *Ministers*, to preferr *Logick* before *Scripture*, and to decline the Scripture-way of dispute.

The *Germane Anabaptists* did thus oppose Scripture to Logicke, *Scripturall* disputings to *Logicall*: & herein promised to *themselues* a double advantage, first *concealement* of their errors vnder the broad leaves of popular orations. Secondly *subterfuge* from the dint of Scripture-consequences; though therefore Mr *Tombs* complaines, as if he required *Syllogismes* in moode & figure in Mr *Marshalls* Sermon; Yet it is no new thing for Men of that way to disowne (as *Doctor Harding* at both dispates did) regular disputings vnder the odious notion of *non scripturall*. For which reason I shall labour (through grace) to evidence, as in *speciall*, that the Logicall rule propounded by the Ministers to *Doctor Harding* in the use of *inartificiall arguments* is Scripturall; so in generall *that Scripturall disputings are Logicall*.

s. 3. The discoverie whereof is accõmodate, as well to the *text*, as *time*; to the *time* because

becauſe that *Anabaptiſticall principle* againſt Scripture-*cõſequence* hath vndermined in this age many *fundamentall principles* in Chriſtianitie of greateſt *conſequence*: to the *text* becauſe herein the Apoſtle aſſumes from their Covenant-Intereſt in generall, and by applying it to the firſt ſeale of the Covenant in particular, Logically concludes his Exhortation, *be baptized every one of you.*

s. 4. Firſt this was the method of our Saviours diſputings (*ratiocinatiuè*) againſt the *Sadduces* who denied the Reſurrection *Mat:* 22. 31. 32. The *Old Teſtament* in noe place expreſſely aſſerted *the dead ſhall riſe:* but *Ex:* 3: 6: *God* ſaid to *Moſes* I am the *God* of *Abraham Iſaac* and *Iacob:* hence *Chriſt* Logically inferrs *the Reſurrection*, and proues the inference by this *medium*. *God is not the God of the dead i. e.* of thoſe who continue ſtill vnder death, but *of the Liuing i. e.* of thoſe who by death paſſe unto Life. This phraſe (*to be the God of any*) deſigning both an act of conſervative *power*, and an act of communicative *grace*. Either then the diſputings of Chriſt in this place are *Scripturall* or not: if the

former, then *Logicall* and consequentiall arguments from Scripture are *Scripturall*: if the latter, then Christ's proofe of the Resurrection was neither sure nor firme: neither was there any cause for the peoples *astonishment* v 33. or *Sadduces silence* v 34. They might easily have answered as *Doctor Harding* misapplied, How readest thou? give an expresse text: this way of arguing is *Logicall* not *scripturall*; especially cõsidering that the *object* of that astonishment was not *Christ's person* but his *doctrine*, and the cause of that silence was *ratio dicti*, not *dicentis*, the force of the speech, not the authority of the *speaker*, for the *Sadduces* disowned his authoritie.

s. 5. Secondly as Christ argues thus *anascevastically* to confute the error of the *Sadduces*: so in like sort he argues *catascevastically* to cleare up the doctrine of his *passion* and *resurrection* to his Disciples *Luke* 24. 25. 26. 27. Christ reprooves them for not acknowledging what the Prophets spoke of him; *viz. that Christ ought to suffer such things & so to enter into glory*: & afterwards v 44. 45. 46. 47. *having opened their understanding that they might*

might vnderstand the Scriptures; he said vnto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoued Christ to suffer & to rise from the dead the third day: which expression in those words are not to be found exactly in any place of the *Old Testament* (the only Scripture at that time,) & therefore, either our *Saviour* did reproue his Apostles without cause, and attributed that to Scripture which belonged not thereto, the affirmation whereof is *blasphemy*; or many truths *virtually* cõteyned in Scripture are thence by *Logicall* consequence to be deduced, & such consequentiall arguments are *Scripturall*.

s. 6. Thirdly, as our Saviour practiseth this method; so he *proscribes* it *Iohn* 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye thinke ye haue eternall Life, and they are they which testifie of me.* Both the *word* designing the duty, and the *motiues* inforcing it prove our conclusion. First the word ἐρευνᾶτε is metaphoricall, transferred either from *metallaries* in diligent *searching* out mines, or from those hounds (we call Tarriers) which with singular sagacitie prosecute vnder earth the hidden

prey; and denotes a diligent *inquisition* of somewhat further then appeares expressely: either then this *inquisition* whereby one thing is inferred from another is *Scripturall*, or our Saviour prescribes to *search* the Scriptures in a way not *Scripturall*. Secondly the motives. First *the Scriptures point out the way to Life*, but this they doe in generall; the præcepts, promises &c. are generall without a Logicall application, they cannot be directiue to any one in particular. Secondly The *Scriptures testifie of Christ*, But no text in the *Old Testament* doth witnes particularly that Iesus the Son of Mary is this Christ, otherwise then by Logicall consequentiall arguments. Either then these *motiues* are not Scripturall, or *Logicall deductions* from Scripture are Scripturall.

s. 7. Fourthly, out of this *Sampler* which the Master gives, *Paul* takes his *worke* in his disputings both with his pen and tongue. First in *Paul's written* disputes he argues by Logicall deductions. In his Epistle to the *Romans*, in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, in his Epistle to the *Galatians*, & in his Epistle

to

to the *Hebrewes*, moſt of the Texts cited from the *Old Teſtament*, are thus inforced by him. Secondly in *Paul's orall* diſputes *Act:* 17. 2. 3. He *reaſoned* with the *Theſſalonians*, the word connotates *Logicall arguing*, & thence *Logick* is called *dialectica*; *OPENING* (the *Syriack* word ſignifies a Logicall *demonſtration*): and ALLEDGING, the *Greek* word ſignifies the *comparing* of one thing with another: all three note that *Paul* managed this great diſpute *Logically*, and it is not conceiveable how otherwiſe he ſhould prove by any Scripure then extant that *the ſame Chriſt whom he then preached, was the Meſſiah.* Yea the text deſcribes his manner of *reaſoning* to be ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν *out of the* Scriptures, he did not only urge the Scriptures *formally* in the words, but alſo *virtuallie* in their conſequences. this method therefore of arguing is *Scripturall* aſwell *as Logicall.*

s.8. Fifthly, leſt any ſay this was an act of *extraordinary authoritie*, as *Paul* was an Apoſtle, and infalliblie directed; not of *ordinarie vocation*; ſee Apollos recorded in the next chapter C. 18. to *have diſputed with the*

Iewes

Iewes in like manner. He was v. 24 an eloquent Man and mighty in the Scriptures i. e. abundantly furnished with abilitie, not only to cite Scripture words, but inforce Scripture *arguments*: accordingly v. 28 he mightily *convinced* the Iewes. διακατηλέγχετο. i. e. by certaine *elenchs* and Logicall argumentations convinced the Iewes. Either then Apollos was not rightly *commended* for his *Logicall disputes*, or his *logicall* disputes were *scripturall*.

s. 9. To these evidences I shall onely add these cautions. First that arguments be not *invoaked* to the Scripture, but *educ't* from it. Secondly, That *logick* and logicall argumentation be employed, not as a *foundation*, but *instrument* of divine truth, not as a *principle* of the thing, but as a *medium* to the discoverie, as an *Handmaid* not as a *Mistresse* to divine *Reuelation*.

CHAP. VII.

CHAP. VII.

The promiſe-ground of Baptiſme what and to whom.

S. 1. THe porch of this *priuilege* in the illative particle (*For*) minded us to remove that ſcruple, at which the *Anabaptiſts* for moſt part ſtumble, concerning the forme of *Scripturall diſputing*. This effected, I might proceede to ſhew from the *promiſe-ground of Baptiſme*, as I have from it's ends that ſome Children ought to be baptized; but that I finde two *vailes* drawne over this text; the firſt reſpects the *object* of the *thing*: the 2d the *object* of the *perſon*. The firſt neceſſitates this inquiry, *what promiſe?* the ſecond this, *to whom this promiſe?*

s. 2. I ſhall anſwer the firſt { *negatiuely.* / *affirmatiuely.*

Negatiuely in three propoſitions, correſpondent

pondent to three misinterpretations (as I conceive) made hereof by the *Anabaptists*. First not the promise of the *Holy Ghosts* miraculous *gifts*, secondly not the promise of the *Messiah* to be borne of that *nation*, thirdly not the bare *offer* or naked tender of the *Couenant promise*. First not the promise of the extraordinarie *gifts* of the *Holy Ghost* made *Ioel*: 2: 28: 29: &c, now accomplished; as appeares; First becauſe the rationall particle (*For*) layes this *promise* and interest therein as the *ground* and Reason of the *duty* exhorted to, and if this be meant of those extraordinary *gifts*; then either the *Apostle* groundeth his exhortation to baptisme on that which is not it's *grouds*: or those that receive not these *gifts* are baptized without *ground*. Secondly, these *Converts* were wounded, and *Peter* propounds this promise to them as a *Cordial* to comfort them: but it is sorrie *comfort* to wounded spirits, to tell them of such *gifts*, as with which their souls may go to *Hell*; and such is *that* extraordinarie and miraculous *gift* of the holy Ghost, *Matth.* 7. 31. therefore either the *Apostles application* is neither

proper,

proper, nor *full*: or that miraculous *gift* of the holy Ghost is not meant here by the *promise*. Thirdly, these extraordinarie *gifts* were not to continue to the *worlds end*, but these promised *blessings* were *to as many as the Lord our God shall call*; and therefore *continuing* whilst any are to be *called*. Fourthly, the *Subiects* of that promise, *Ioel* 2. are not the same with those here mentioned, *will any say your children here, signifies the same with your old men there?*

s. 3. Secondly, not the *promise* of the *Messiah* to be born of that *nation*; for First, God had accomplished this *promise*, and of a promise accomplished, 'tis not proper to say in the present, *the promise is*. Secondly, *they* had *crucified* the Messiah so *promised*; the guilt of this *sin* was the weight to their *sorrow*, to mind them hereof would not abate, but increase smart. Thirdly, the *seal* of baptisme is not annexed to the *promise* of Christ's cõming: but to the *benefits* which flow from his comming; *that* therefore cannot here be meant by this promise whereof Baptisme's a seal.

s. 4. Thirdly, not the *bare offer*, or naked tender of the *Covenant-promise*; for First, the *Iews* were at that time differenc'd from the *Gentiles*, as *children of the Covenant*, Act. 3. 25. to whom the *promise* belonged in peculiar *Rom.* 9. but our Saviour commissionated before that time the *offer* and tender of the promise, to be made to all *nations*. Secondly, in no place of *Scripture* (that I know) is the *offer* of the promise called the *promise*.

s. 5. Secondly, I answer *affirmatively*; the Promise here meant is *the Covenant of Grace*, by which God confers, and we receive *remission* of sins; this exposition might be confirmed by *paralel* Scripture expressions, wherein this *Covenant* is thus called the *promise*, and it answers exactly to these *penitents* condition, and to the *Apostles* exhortation. To the First; are they troubled for the *guilt* of themselves and children? the *Covenant* of grace, and *remission* of sin belongs to them and their children. To the Second, they have *right* to the Covenant, therefore to the *seal*; *The promise is to you and your children, therefore be baptized every one of you.*

s. 6. But

s. 6. But this *Covenant* of grace (as in the former phraſe of *remiſsion of ſins*, connotating the *ends* of baptiſme: ſo here) in this term of the *promiſe*, connotating the *ground* of baptiſme, is held forth unto them, with ſpecial reſpect to the *external Oeconomie*, and diſpenſation. Firſt, it could not be otherwiſe a grounded *motive*, to external *baptiſme*: Nor Secondly, could it be rightly intituled the *promiſe*; the *purpoſe* of God may be *ſecret*, but the *promiſe* muſt be *declared*: nor doth God otherwiſe declare his *Covenant*, and Covenant-promiſe than by his *Ordinances*, the external adminiſtration thereof.

s. 7. The ſecond enquirie is, *To whom this promiſe?* the Text returns anſwer, Firſt *to you*. Secondly, *to your children*. Thirdly *to them that are afar off*. Firſt *to you*; the Church of the *Iews* had not at this preſent either totally, or finally *reiected* the Goſpel, & therefore they continued as yet their *Goſpel Church intereſt*; in which regard, as in the Covenant of grace God promiſeth, *I will be thy God*: ſo the Apoſtle in the text owns God with ſpecial application to the Church

of the Iews, *the Lord our God*; and accordingly tells them in the present, *the promise is to you*.

s. 8. Secondly, *to your children*: to evade the force and evidence of this text for the *Baptisme of children* of incovenanted parents, two *figurative* interpretations are made hereof: First, some by *children* understand such as are *analogically so called*, or children by imitation; against which exposition I offer these Arguments, First, though believing *Abraham* is analogically the father of believers, yet how these *Iews* who were not at present cõverted are exhorted in this text to conversion, should in this instance be propounded: in like kind the presidential fathers of converts is not conceivable. Secondly, the *cause* of that sorrow which sadned these *Iews*, and against which they are comforted, was their own and *natural children's guilt*, which cause of sorrow, a promise to children analogicall could not remove; Either therefore the plaister doth not reach the sore, or the sence is, *q*. *d*. your *natural* children who are included in the *guilt* with you, are with you

included

included in the *Covenant*, and *promise*.

s. 9. Secondly, some by children understand *grown men*, and such with respect to their *future personal calling*; but first this *argument* would have been *weak*, and imperswasive to *baptisme*: as if the *Apostle* had said, Whereas you and *your children* were confederates in the *Covenant* of promise, as *formerly* administered, become now Christians, *be baptized* into the Gospel Administration of the same *Covenant*, and ye shall be admitted thereto at present, but your *children* shall be excluded, and left in the state of *Infidels*, of necessitie, till *adult*, and when *adult*, till God *anew* externally, and personally *call* them. Certainly the *Iews* who were so *zealous* for *Circumcision*, though onely the *Sacrament*, whereby the Covenant-interest was consigned, would never have endured an utter *exclusion* of their children, from Covenant, and not in any place *except* against it; much less, would this *mention* of their children at present *excluded*, have been of a perswasive *virtue* to invite them to *baptisme*.

s. 10. Secondly, that these words are *consola-*

consolative will not be denied (as I think) by any: that (as *consolative*) they are comprehensive of the *whole* cause of their sorrow, which cause was not only the *guilt* of Christ's blood, and *Curse* by that guilt, drawn on themselves, but respectively on their *children* also. At the time of this imprecatiō they had some *young* children, in about two months time they could not be *adult*, and before adult, and personally *called*, might die; so their fathers (as to thē) left without ground, for *hope* or *comfort*, as therefore *children* specifically are meant in that *imprecation*: so are they meant in this *consolation*.

s. 11. I conceive the intire sense to be this, *That*, as under the *former* administration of the *Covenant* of promise, the *Iews*, and their *children* were Ioynt fœderates: evē so, though the external administration be *changed*, yet the Covenant-interest is not changed, it being impossible that of the *same Covenant*, the *subfœderates* should not be the *same* specifically. Therefore since *they* and their *children continued* their Covenant-interest, the Apostle exhorts them to perform the Covenant-condition,

condition, *Repent*, and owne the *Meßiah* as alreadie come, in his Goſpel Adminiſtration, *be baptized every one of you*, i.e. every one interelled in the Covenant of promiſe, and theſe were they and their children; and in regard the Lord conveys grace, and vouchſafes *remiſſion of ſins*, by his Covenant Adminiſtration, he tells them there is hope in *Iſrael* concerning *themſelves*, and their *children*, who are thus intituled to the Covenant of promiſe in its viſible adminiſtration, and therefore notwithſtanding that dreadfull imprecation of *Chriſt's bloud* on themſelves, and their children, here ſays the Apoſtle, is for them as well pardon, as comfort. *The promiſes to you, and your children.*

s. 12. Thirdly, *to them that are afar off*, i.e. The Gentiles, *Eph.* 2. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. which title is given to them as *ſtrangers* to the Covenant of promiſe, and *aliens* from the Common-wealth of *Iſrael*: Yet with ſpecial reſpect to their *future* Covenant-intereſt, ſignified by the following *exegeſis*, *even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.*

s. 13. By *call* here, we are not to under-

stand *strictly*, or only, that which is called an *effectuall call*; for then none could according to rule be baptized vnlesse *effectually called*, which is disproved by the first instance: nor only an externalll *offer* of the Covenant, and invitation thereto, for then *every hearer* (as such) should be capable of baptisme: but a *call into visible Church-state and Covenant*, whereto also many are *called* that are not *elected Mat*: 22: 14, which call is incompleate before baptisme, compleat by baptisme.

s. 14. This *exegisis* is onely to be apylied to such as are mentioned in the *last clause*, for First, the notion *of afar off* signifies the state of the *Gentiles*, as not in Covenant; and the *Iews* and their *children* opposed thereto, are signified to be *nigh. i. e.* in Covenant; and if in Covenant, then alreadie *called* to that Covenant state, unto which the *Gentiles* also were to be *called*. Secondly, if by this condition of *future* calling, the promise made to the *children* of believing *Iews* were limitted, there would be no greater *benefit* held forth to them, than to the *children* of *Pagans*: and so the argument took from the *benefit* accru-

ing

ing to their *children*, must be *null* and void. Thirdly, if *calling* here should be referred to all the *antecedents*: then there could be no Reason, to have mentioned their *children* at all; but it had been sufficient to have said, the *promise* is to *all* them, whom the *Lord our God shall call*.

The Argument.

All those to whom the *Covenant* of grace, in its *visible* administration *actually* belongs, ought to be *baptized*; But to some *infants*, *viz.* the children of *incovenanted* persons, the Covenant of grace in its visible administration actually belongs; *therefore* some infants, *viz.* the children of incovenanted parents ought to be baptized. This *argument* in both the premises is clearly conteined in this *text*.

s. 15. The *major* is clear. The *Apostle* grounds his exhortation to *Baptisme* on External-Covenant-relation, Be *baptized for*, *&c.* which *ground* is either insufficient, or sufficient; if *insufficient*, then the *Apostle* by building his exhortation thereon, *erred* in the discharge of his Apostolicall function: If *sufficient*, then those who partake of that

ground, *viz.* those to whom that *covenant* in like kind *belongs*, ought to be baptized.

s. 16. The *minor* more clear, *the promise*, *i.e.* the Covenant of grace visibly administered, *is*, *i.e.* belongs even at present, *to you and your children*, *i.e.* not onely intentionally, or with respect to *future calling*, as to the *Gentiles* who are *afar off*: but actually to you and them, as being *nigh* in that respect, and distinguished from those *afar off*.

The Conclusion is necessarie; therefore *your children*, *i.e.* the children of incovenanted parents, ought to be *baptized*.

CHAP. VIII.

CHAP. VIII.

All Covenant-Relatives have right to Baptisme.

S. 1. THe *Argument* in the text from Covenant Relation, is so clear and full a Scripture-proof, for baptizing *the incovenanted infants, of incovenanted parents,* that no person can prove the *resurrection* of individual members, in the bodie natural, more clearly and fully. It is indeed clear by Scripture, that the *bodie* shall be raised, and clear that the hands and feet are *parts* and members of the bodie, and consequently clear, that these parts shall be raised, though no Scripture *expresly* and particularly mention *the resurrection*: in like sort it is clear by the *text*, that all those to whom the *covenant* of grace in its visible administration *actually* belongs, ought to be baptized. And clear by

the *text*, the Covenant of grace in its *visible* administration *actually* belongs to the *children* of incovenanted parents, and consequently clear, that such *children* ought to be *baptized*.

s. 2. But though this *argument* is so clear and full for baptizing of *infants*, and the *text* so clear and full for proofs of this *argument*: yet in regard the *Anabaptists* earnestly contend against it, I shall labour to inforce, by other places of Scripture, both the propositions.

First, the *Major*; All those to whom the *Covenant* of grace in its *visible* administration *actually* belongs, ought to be baptized to the discoverie of *light* here, I shall open the *windowes* in these Aphorismes.

s. 3. First God deales with man by way of a *mixt Covenant*, (as most suitable to the reasonable nature.) *i.e.* God imposeth his *Laws* on man, not in a way of absolute *soveraignetie*: but in a way of *condistention*, making *promises* of blessings, to the *condition* of dutie, which *dutie* might have been exacted from *man*, though no *promise* had been vouchsafed by

by *God*; man therefore is not simply disingaged as to the contents of this covenant, for which reason, even before mutual consent, this dealing of God is called *his Covenant*, yet so, that without mans *consent* to, and performance of the *condition* of dutie, God will not perform the *promise* of the blessings.

s. 4. Secondly, the stipulations in the *Covenant* of grace, are the *promise* of Christ, salvation by Christ: the *condition* of Faith to receive Christ, and sinceritie to obey Christ received.

s. 5. Thirdly, this Covenant is administered *inwardly* by the *spirit*, working faith and sinceritie, applying *Christ* and salvation, and thereby causing an intrinsecall consociation between *God* and his *people*.

s. 6. Fourthly, this Covenant is administered *outwardly* by the *Ordinances*, as moral instruments, in the hands of the Spirit, to its inward work, and sensible tokens of an extrinsecall consociation between *God* and his *people*.

s. 7. Fifthly, the outward and inward Covenant-Administration is *distributio subjecti*

jecti secundum adjuncta; not signifying a double *species*, but double *notion* of Covenant-Administration, took from the double manner of Gods administering the same.

s. 8. Sixthly, all those who have right to the *inward*, have right to the *outward*: but not *è Contra*, for to many the *externals* are rightly administered, to whom the *grace* of the Covenant-workings and applyings of the *Spirit* are not administered.

s. 9. Seventhly, *Actual* covenant-interest distinguisheth from *intentional*, such as some *Gentiles* (not as yet actually incovenanted) have, and *children* of incovenanted parents as yet unborn.

s. 10. I should have added no more to this Proposition, but that *Doctor Harding* at the first dispute thought fit to denie it; and by his denial ingaged me to prove it, to which end at that time I urged, and on the *Doctors* desire wrote this *Syllogisme*.

All those who are actually members of the visible Church ought to be baptized, but all those to whom the Covenant of grace in its visible administration actually belongs, are actually members

of

of the visible Church; therefore, they ought to be baptized.

s. 11. The *major* may be proved by 1. *Cor.* 12. 13. *we are all baptized into one Bodie; All,* whether Iews, or Gentiles: *baptized, i. e.* solemnly, regularly, and ordinarily admitted by Baptisme; *into one bodie, i. e.* the *Church* v. 28. the *visible* Church, liable to *schisme* v. 25. subject to *sympathie* v. 26. capable of *members organical* v. 27, 28.

s. 12. By *Ep.* 5. 26. Christ *cleanseth* his Church, & members thereof, ordinarily by external means and ordinances; *with water,* in the Sacrament of baptisme: *by the word,* of the *covenant* declared in the preaching of the Gospel. The *inward cleansing-effect* is peculiar to the members *invisible,* the *external ordinances* (as moral instruments) are applicable to the members *visible,* as *visible;* therefore, to *all* such: yet suited to their respective *capacities.*

s. 13. By Christ's commission *Matth.* 28. 19. *Christ* authoriseth his *Ambassadors* to make *Disciples, i. e.* to admit solemnly, and receive *Disciples:* and institutes *baptisme* as the way and external means of such admission, and reception, *Baptizing them.* Such then as are actual *members* of Christ's visible *Church,* are actual

Disciples in Christ's visible *School*, inrighted therefore to solemn admission and reception thereto, & consequently ought to be *baptized*.

s. 14. *The Argument*. If the Scripture *indefinitely* commissionate the *baptisme of* visible *Church-members*, and there be no *limitation* of that commission *exclusive* of *any* such, then all those who are actual members of the visible Church ought to be baptized: But the *antecedent* is true, therefore true is the *consequent*.

s. 15. The *Minor* is confessed by the *Anabaptists*: yea some of them accompt *Covenant-interests* the form of the *Church*, and to that purpose cite *Ez.* 16. 8. *Ier.* 31. 33. *Heb.* 8. 10. *Gal.* 3. 18, 19. and *ch.* 4. 8. *Rom.* 9. 8. And *visible Covenant-interests* is as constitutive of the *Church-visible*, as invisible, of the invisible. Most clearly, when *Covenanters* are said to be *Saints*, *Psal.* 50. 5. when by visible Covenant interest the *visible Church* is distinguished from *Gentiles Eph.* 2. 12. and when the Lord *avoucheth* Covenanters collectively, *to be his People*: *Deut.* 26. 17. 18. and 29. 12. 13. this assumption is more evident than can be contradicted. I proceed therefore to the next proposition: which is the hinge of the Controversie between us and the Anabaptists.

CHAP. IX.

Chap. ix.

Children of incovenanted persons are Covenant-Relatives.

S. 1. The Second or *Minor* Proposition of the *Argument* inforced in this *text*, from the promise-ground of baptisme is, *That to some infants*, viz. *the children of incovenanted persons, the Covenant of grace, in its visible administration, actually belongs.*

First, by *incovenanted persons*, I intend not true believers onely, but all externally relatives to *Iesus Christ*, as the *Messiah* already come, (whereby they are differenced from the *Gentiles* who owne no *Messiah*, and *Iews* who expect one future) in the same Latitude as the *Church of God* is used 1. *Cor:* 10. 32. And though many of these may *build wood, hay, & stuble* on this foundation 1. *Cor:* 3. 11, 12. Yet if this *foundation* be rightly *layd*, I con-

ceive them *incovenanted*, and their children thereby *inrighted* to Baptisme. Secondly, by the *children* of such *incovenanted persons*; I intend not only (though principally) the *natural* children, but all *adopted* into their families, in such sort, that the *parentall* authoritie is derived to them; as the *bought* servants under the Law, were to be *circumcised*: though the *hired* were not. *Gen.* 17. 12, 13. *Exod.* 12. 44, 45.

s. 2. The truth of the Proposition appears from these considerations: First, the children of *Abraham*, and of his *Covenant-seed* had a *stated* interest before Christ's incarnation to the Covenant of grace, in its external and visible administration; *&c.* The force of this argument will be intelligible, if reduced to these heads. First God's Covenant with *Abraham* was a Covenant of *grace*. Secondly, *circumcision* consigned that *covenant* of grace, in its *visible* administration. Thirdly, the children of Covenanters had a *stated* interest to that *covenant*; so administered. Fourthly, neither the *essentials* of the Covenant of grace, or of Covenant-privi-

priviledge, or intereſt, ſtated in the old Teſtament, is any where repealed in the *New*. Fifthly, all eſſentiall Covenant-priviledges, and intereſts *ſtated* in the old Teſtament, and not *repealed* in the New, continue ſtill in force.

§. 3. First, Gods Covenant with *Abraham*, was a Covenant of *grace*. This Covenant is often *recorded*, and each *record* thus explained. The record of this Covenant *Gen.* 15. 6. is thus explained by *Paul*, Rom. 4. 3. The *record* of this Covenant *Gen.* 22. 17, 18. is thus explained by *Zacharie*, Luke 1. 73, 74, 75. *the poſſeſſing the gate of enemies, in Geneſis, is called, Deliverance from the hands of enemies in Luke. The Bleſſing in Geneſis, is called, Power to ſerve God in holineſs, righteouſneſs, and ſinceritie, in Luke.* Chriſt being ſent to *bleſs* us eſpecially in this, *in turning us from our iniquitie, Act.* 3. 26. for which reaſon, alſo the receipt of the *Spirit* is called the *bleſſing* of *Abraham* Gal. 3. 14.

§. 4. But moſt clearly in the eſſentiall parts and Sacramental conſignation is *this Covenant* recorded *Gen.* 17. 7. and as well

the *parts* there expressed, as the *consignation* there instituted proves this *covenant* to be a Covenant of *grace*. First, the *condition* required is not unsinning but *sincere* obedience, *v.* 2. Secondly, the blessing promised, *I will be thy God v.* 7, 8. includes heavenly good things, *Heb.* 11. 13, 14, 15, 16. Thirdly, the *subfederate* is lapsed man. Fourthly, the *consignation* seals righteousness by faith, *Rom.* 4. 11.

§. 5. The *renewall* of the Covenant to *Abrahams* Church-covenant seed, in the wilderness, is likewise recorded *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. and explained to be the same *Covenant of grace*, the same, word of *faith*, with that which the Apostles *preached* Rom. 10. 6. compared with *Deut.* 30. 11, 12, 13, 14.

§. 6. Add hereunto, that either that Covenant was only of temporall concernment, or of *eternall* also. If only temporall, then God dealt with the *Patriarchs* as with brute beasts: if also *eternall*, then it was either a covenant of *works*, or of *grace*. If of works, then first, it was not prejudicial to the unbelieving *Jews* to be *broken* off; nor secondly advantagious

vantagious to beleeving Jews to be continued; not to beleeving *Gentiles* to be *ingrafted* Contrary to *Rom.* 11. Not thirdly could *Christ* be the *mediatour* of it contrary to *Gal.* 3. 17. Not fourthly could *grace* be *offered* by it contrary to *Deut.* 30. 6. I only name these arguments because I have promised and resolve (through the Lords grace) a distinct discourse on this subject.

s. 7. Secondly *Circumcision* consigned that Covenant of *grace*, in its *visible* administration. First if *Circumcision* had onely consigned the Land of *Canaan*, then to strangers & *proselytes* it consigned nothing, for *these* might not enjoy any setled, or continuate inheritance therein.

s. 8. The Apostle expresly determins, that *circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith* Rom. 4. 11. not only of *Abraham's faith*, but of *Abraham's righteousness by faith*, *i. e.* that *righteousness* whereby *beleeving Abraham*, and all beleivers are justified. The discoverie whereof is the Apostle's scope in that chapter. Yet may we not conceive here, as if every individual person being *circumci-*

sed,

ſed, was alſo *juſtified*; in regard *circumciſion* conſigned this Covenant with reſpect to its *external* adminiſtration, and many not internally gracious, might be, and were *externally* Abraham's Covenant-ſeed, *Iohn* 8. 37. hence doth God renew that Covenant *Deut.* 29. 14. with Iſraelites collectively; *him*, not *them*. Yea reckons the *children* of Idolatrous Iews, to be *born to him* Ez. 16. 20. and even unbelievers to be his *own* Ioh. 1. 11. *i. e.* externally and in reſpect of the external-covenant-adminiſtration.

s. 9. The third general is, That the *Children* of Covenanters had a *ſtated* intereſt, before Chriſt's incarnation, to the *covenant* of grace, as *externally* adminiſtered. The truth whereof is evident, by all theſe *records* of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and inſtanced, s. 3. and 4. wherein Abraham and his ſeed are ſpecified as Confœderates. The only difficultie is, what ſeed is here meant? Anſ. Firſt *negatively*, not his *natural* ſeed only: for Firſt, *Proſelytes* came not out of *Abraham's* loyns, therefore were not his *natural* ſeed, yet might be *circumciſed*. Secondly, the Apoſtatiz'd

postatiz'd progenie of *Ishmael* and *Esau* did come out of *Abraham's* loins, and so continued *Abraham's natural* seed, yet (during that Apostasie) might not be circumcised.

s. 10. Secondly, *affirmatively* Abrahams *Covenant-seed, i. e.* all persons incovenanted, native *Israelites*, proselyte *Gentiles*, and visible Christians *Rom:* 4. 16, 17. to which *seed* whatever right Abraham as a Covenant-Father was invested with descends (not by nature) but by virtue of this *Covenant*; as seems intimated *Gen.* 17. 7. *seed in their Generations i. e.* parents generating, and Children generated; for though a Child derive not from his Father any *inherent* grace, yet some *relative* he may; as one by a birth priviledge may be *free* in a Corporatiō: though thereby he derives not *skill*, to improve that Freedom.

This truth appears further by the *renewall* of the Covenant of grace, *Deut.* 29. 11. where the *little ones* are expresly specified, as *Joynt-Covenanters* with their fathers.

s. 11. The fourth *general* is, that neither

the *essentials* of the Covenant of grace, nor of Covenant Priviledge, or interest *stated* in the *old Testament*, are any where *repealed* in the *new*.

The truth hereof appears by the *identitie*, and sameness of the Covenant, under *both dispensations*, which were incompossible, if the essentials were not the same; and the essentials are not the same, if those stated in the old, are repealed in the new.

s. 12. It would be importune to discourse here of all the *Covenant-essentials*, and to demonstrate *what* they are, and that they are *not repealed*; but it sufficeth to shew at present that as to the *federate children of incovenanted parents*, there is no *repeal* of the essentials of the Covenant of grace, or essential priviledges or interests thereof.

s. 13. It hath been plainly proved that the *children* of incovenanted parents had a *Covenant-interest*, stated on them in the *old Testament*; if this be *repealed*, let the *Anabaptists* produce one *Scripture evidence* expres or consequentiall for that *repeal*: If it be not repealed, the next general will prove, it continues

tinues in force, though it had been only stated in the old Testament. The *Anabaptists* here use to exclaim that the *orthodox* impose on them to prove a *negative*. I conceive this exclamation unjust, and the whole proof in this dispute to lie on their part; for *they who denie the administration of baptisme till such an age, do virtually affirm, the limitation of it to that age: and they who denie, the covenant interest of children now, which formerly they had, do virtually affirm the repeal of that interest*, and consequently, though the propositions *formally* considered, or according to the words, are *negative*: yet *materially* considered and according to the things, they are *affirmative*. Suppose a child Impleads an *Executor*, for a legacie bequeathed by his fathers *will*: the Executor answers, First that *will* is repealed, and Secondly in another Will confirmed, the payment is limited to such an Age; doth it not lie on the Executor to prove this his Plea? This instance is parallel to the present case; the *Orthodox* urge their *Fathers first testament*, (*i. e.* not first specifically but numerically) inrighting the children of

incovenanted persons, to the Covenant of grace in its visible administration. The *Anabaptists* answer, it *was* so formerly, but it *is* not so *now*: they are not so intighted, to the Covenant, till they come to such an Age. The *Orthodox* reply, Produce *evidence*, for the repeal, for the limitation, who then thus exclaim, as if it were imposed on them, to prove a negative: the unreasonableness of which exclamation is, to all reasonable unprejudic'd Christians, sufficient argument that *the Anabaptists can produce no arguments against the covenant interest of infants, specifically considered.*

s. 14. The Orthodox however *pro superpondio* urge diverse arguments to prove, that *this interest is not repealed.* I shall only hint at some few of those, collected out of *Rom.* 11. First *v* 17. only *some* of the *Iews* were broken off, others therefore *remained in* the Covenant, as formerly. 2d. *v.* 20. only the *unbelievers* of the *Iews* were broken off: *believers* therefore remained in the Covenant, as formerly. Thirdly, *v.* 24. the *Iews* at their calling shall be grafted into their *owne* Olive, *i. e.* into

i. e. into the *same* Church estate essentially, as formerly. Fourthly, *v.* 24. *All* Israel shall be *saved*; *All*, *i. e.* all specifically no intire species excluded; *saved*, *i. e.* from their off broken state.

This argument may be thus disposed.

Those *Iews* who remained in, or shall be again called to their former covenant-state, and interest, their *children* are inrighted to the *Covenant* of grace, as formerly. But *some* of the Iews remained in, and *others* of them shall be again called to their former covenant state and interest: *Therefore* their children are inrighted to the Covenant of grace as formerly.

s. 15. And if this Covenant-interest *doth* belong to the *children* of believing Iews, or *did* belong to the *children* of those unbelievers before they were broken off, or *shall* belong to the *children* of believing Iews when reingrafted: then it likewise belongs to the *children* of incovenanted *Gentiles*. Accordingly the cited *verses* 17, 19, 24. prove, that the *Gentiles* are grafted into the *same* Church and Covenant, from which the un-

believing *Iews* were broken off, and in which the believing *Iews*, *some* were then *continued*, others shall be *reingrafted*. The Partition wall is now removed, be we Iews or Gentiles, adult or Infants, we are *one* in Christ Iesus.

s. 16. To the pretension that this Scripture is meant of the Church, as *invisible*, it is opposed: First, this breaking off was *visible*, such as wherein *Gods goodness and severitie might be beheld*, v. 22. and such, as whereby the *Gentiles* were in danger of *boasting against the Iews*, v. 18, 20. Secondly, *unbelievers* were broken off; and this, from the Church as *invisible*, is doubly impossible: First, that any *unbelievers* should be *branches* thereof. Secondly, that any *branches* thereof should be *broken off*.

s. 17. The fifth general is, that *All essential Covenant priviledges and interests, stated in the old Testament, and not repealed in the new, continue still in force*.

For evidence hereof I shall first propound some considerations, explaining the ground and reason of distinguishing between the *essentials* and *circumstantials* of the Covenant

of

of grace, *stated* in the *old Testament*, and then I shall prove the *conclusion*.

s. 18. First, in regard *Christ* was in all things to be made *like to us*, (sin only excepted) it was necessarie, that he should be *born* of some *nation*.

s. 19. Secondly, in regard he was to be held forth as the *Saviour* of the *world*, it was necessarie, that *that nation* should be *distinguished* from all other nations of the world, by peculiar *priviledges*, that all the *world* might thereby be invited, and directed *where*, and *of whom*, to expect this *Saviour*.

s. 20. Thirdly, in regard the *Covenant priviledges* concern both this life, and that which is to come; whereof those concerning this life, are of the *lower*, those concerning the life to come, are of the *higher* form; as it was suitable to *Divine wisdom* to reserve the more particular and clear discoveries of *spiritual priviledges*, untill that fulnese of time came, wherein God sent forth his Son, made of a woman: (for which reason *Christ* is said to be the *Mediator of a better Covenant*, and

the

the Covenant of grace, under the Gospel administration, *to be founded on better promises* Heb. 8. 6. *better*, not in the *substance* but in the *manner* of dispensation) so was it suitable to *Divine wisdom*, that before Christ's incarnation (the discoverie of *temporal* priviledges being *at that time* more clear, distinct, particular; because the more clear, distinct, particular discoverie of *spiritual priviledges* was reserved for a *better* dispensation) *that nation* of whom the *Messiah* was to come, should be *distinguished* from all others by *temporal blessings*, as a land of *Canaan*, &c. which *Temporals* were not only *accomplishments* to them, of that part of the Covenant which concerns this life, but *types* also of that which concerns the life to come; and therefore both in respect of their *Covenant-ground*, and *typicall end*, laid to be *everlasting*, as Canaan an *everlasting* possession *Gen.* 17. 8.

s. 21. Fourthly, in regard these particular *temporal privileges* had such speciall respect to Christ's incarnation, & served in such a peculiar manner, to mark forth the *Jewish nation*, that the *Messiah* should be born there;

there; therefore as the *ceremonial* law, respecting the *satisfaction* to be made by *Christ*, so these particular *temporal privileges*, respecting that numericall *humane nature* wherein (assumed) Christ should make that satisfaction, were circumstantials, and did cease, (though not in their *relative*, yet in their *absolute* consideration) when *Christ* (incarnated) did break down the Partition wall, distinguishing Iew and Gentile. Whereas the *essentials* neither are repealed, nor cease, but are in the *new Testament*, of the same virtue as in the *old*.

s. 22. Correspondently, I assert this conclusion; *That though there were no renewed establishment (in the new Testament) of this Covenant-essential: yet the same being stated in the Old, and not repealed in the New, continues still in force.*

s. 23. First, appointments of *God* are of *Divine authoritie*, in what kind soever delivered, whether in naturals, or positives, by word, or writing, in the old, or in the new Testament. The *manner* of deliverie is but *accidental* to this Authoritie; and whatever is

established by *Divine authoritie* is unalterable, irrepealable until *Diuine authority* repeal it, or alter it. *Ejusdem est condere & tollere*, to repeal or even alter is an act of (at least) the *same* (if not *superior*) power. Either therefore some other besides God must partake *Divine power*, or a power *superior* to Divine, or God's appointments are *in force*, until himself please to *repeal* them; Consequently the *essentials* (this particularly of *fœderate children*) of the Covenant of grace, being stated in the *old* Testament, and not repealed in the *new*, continue still in force.

s. 24. Secondly, if the old Testament (under the Gospel dispensation) be of any force, it is of force to the *essentials* of the Covenant of grace *stated* thereby, and not *repealed* by the *new*. The consequence is undeniable, and the antecedent proved against the *Germane Anabaptists* (who denied it) by such evident *Scriptures*, that I shall only need *cite* them, you *read* and *believe* them; *Matth.* 5.17,19. *Luke* 16. 29. *John* 5. 39. *Rom.* 15. 4. *Eph.* 2.20. 2. *Tim.* 3 15,16,17.

The Argument.

On whomsoever the *Covenant* of grace, in its

its visible administration, was actually *stated* in the *old* Testament, if it be not *repealed* in the *new*, to them *that Covenant*-interest still belongeth, and consequently they ought to be *baptized*: But on the *children* of incovenanted persons, the *Covenant* of grace, in its visible administration, was actually *stated* in the *old* Testament and it is not *repealed* in the *new*. *Therefore*, to the *children* of incovenanted persons, *that Covenant*-interest still belongeth, and consequently, *they ought to be baptized*.

CHAP. X.

Infants Baptisme how inferred from Circumcision.

S. 1. HAving in the last Chapter inforced the Argument from Covenant-interest to Baptisme, and discovered (in part) the *ground* & reason of distinguish-

ing between *Covenant-eſſentials*, and *Circumſtantials*, ſtated in the old Teſtament; it is not impertinent to conſider the *uſe* of this diſtinction, in the often aforecited *Covenant-eſtabliſhment*, recorded *Gen.* 17. which will alſo lead us to the diſcoverie, how Proteſtants argue from *Circumciſion* to Baptiſme, and *this argument* being conſequent to, and dependent on the former of *Covenant-intereſt*, is aptly conſiderable in this place.

s. 2. In that Covenant-eſtabliſhment, this diſtinction is applicable both to the *Fœderates*, and *parts* of the Covenant. As to the *Fœderates*, Abraham conſidered as a Covenant-father, and his Covenant-ſeed, whether by propagation, or proportion, *v.* 7. is *eſſential:* But Abraham conſidered perſonally, and his natural ſeed, (as ſuch) is only *circumſtantial*, *v.* 8. to this Covenant.

s. 3. The parts of the Covenant are *promiſe*, and *condition*; the eſſentials of the *promiſe*, are firſt eſtabliſhed in the *general*, *v.* 7. *to be a God to Abraham, and his ſeed in their generations.* The *circumſtantials* of the promiſe are next eſtabliſhed in the *particular*, *v.* 8. *to*

give

give them the land of Canaan. In like kind the *essentials* of the condition, are first established in the *general*, v. 9. *to keep the Covenant.* The *circumstantials* next in the *particular*, v. 10. *to be circumcised.* The particular promise (then) of *Canaan*, and particular rite of *circumcision*, are circumstantials: respecting rather the *dispensation*, (and ceasing therewith) than *essence* of the Covenant.

But the general promise of *being a God to Abraham, and his Covenant-seed*, and the general condition of *keeping the Covenant*, are essentials, and extend to all Covenanters *in their generations*, Parents and Children.

s. 4. To this it is consequent, that *infants* of incovenanted parents are concerned, as in the general *promise*, so in the *general condition*; therefore ingaged to *keep God's covenant.* This condition & keeping is intrinsecall in the *covenant-grace*, and extrinsecall in the *covenant-administration*: which later (being instituted) the Lord will have *kept* by every Covenanter some way or other; But *children* are not capable of keeping the same any way, if not by a *passive* reception of its initiatorie. And therefore the Lord seems to intimate that he intended *herein* they should thus *keep* it as well by instituting Cir-

cumcision (*hereon*) to be the *initiatorie*, for that dispensation: as by *repeating* the general condition, and *applying* it particularly to this *species* and initiatorie; *This is my Covenant, which ye shall keep, Every man-child among you shall be circumcised*, v. 10.

s. 5. Nor is it improper to observe here, that though *God* had formerly strook Covenant with *Abraham*; yet is there no expres of his *childrens* interes, as *joynt-federates*, untill this time, wherein this initiatorie was instituted; which seems to imply (*herein*) a special respect to *infants*, who at this time are specially mentioned.

s. 6. Observe likewise, that though the *promise* of *Canaan* considered absolutely, and in particular, be *circumstantial*: yet even this *circumstance* (considered relatively, and generically) concludes, that the *promises of this life*, as well as that which is to come, are essentially *comprized* in the *Covenant*. Though in like manner the *condition* of *circumcision* considered absolutely, and in the particular symbole, be *circumstantial*: yet this *circumstance* (considered relatively, and generically,) concludes, that supposing an *initiatorie* consignation of the Covenant instituted, the same

same is applicable to the *incovenanted children* of incovenanted parents.

s. 7. In arguing then from Circumcision to Baptisme, we do not suppose circumcision to be a *type* of baptisme: but both to be *types* of the *same* grace, and neither the *antitype* of the other. Nor do we argue from circumcision to baptisme in its symbole, or circumstance, but in its generical nature, Covenant ground, end.

s. 8. First, Circumcision and Baptisme consigne (essentially) the *same* grace and covenant of grace, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. to be *circumcised* in Christ, and *buried* with Christ in *baptisme* denotes the same grace. The Apostle therefore rightly determines against *Circumcision teachers*, that the *compleatness* of Christians is not *inferior* to that of the Iews: not *intrinsecally*, the *same* grace essentially is consigned to *both*, in Christ; not *extrinsecally*, Circumcision and Baptisme are essentially the *same* consignation of grace. Hence the *Iews circumcised* are said to be *baptized*, 1. Cor. 10. 1, 2. And *Gentiles baptized*, to be *of the circumcision*, Phil. 3. 3.

s. 9. Se-

s. 9. Secondly, though the *good pleasure* of God (determining for the future to *embodie* his Covenant-relatives in a more *comprehensive* societie, than the *familiall*) was the *ground* and reason of *instituting* an initiatorie consignation of the Covenant of grace: yet the *ground* and reason of *applying* it (being instituted) is *external-covenant-interest*. That a *rite* should be of this *kind*, and for this *end*, is grounded proximately on *Gods command*, but that a *rite* so commanded should be *applied* to such persons is *grounded* proximately on the *Covenant*, not on the *command*.

s. 10. On which ground the *Iews* used to circumcise *proselyte-strangers*, not inhabiting *Iudea*; for, in regard it was accompted by them *Temple-pollution*, to admit thereinto *any uncircumcised*, Acts 21. 28. and in regard such *proselyte-strangers* (as the *Eunuch*, Act. 8. 27.) were admitted, and a *blessing* assured on their *access*, 1. *Kings* 8. 41, 42, 43. It is consequent, *they were circumcised*: yet is there *no expres* for circumcising any such in *Gods command*; *They* were therefore *circumcised* on the *Covenant-ground*. On which also the

Lord

Lord seems to *ground* the *application* of circumcision, *Gen.* 17. 9. 10. *therefore*, &c.

s. 11. That in like sort, the Apostle *grounds* Baptisme on the *Covenant promise*, in the text, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. And that *children* of incovenanted Persons are herein interessed, was evidenced in the former Chapters.

s. 12. The *argument* therefore deduced by us, from *circumcision*, to *baptisme*, partly ariseth from the identitie of *grace*, in both consignations: but especially from the identitie of *ground*, for both applications.

s. 13. That *infant-age*, or defect of understanding, *in actu exercito* is no *barr* to the application of *Baptisme*, on (and according to) this *covenant-ground*, we likewise argue from *Circumcision*, thus:

s. 14. If this *defect* be sufficient to exclude *children now*, from the *first* solemn consignatorie of the *Covenant* of grace, as externally administered, the same would have been as forceable against *infants circumcision*, as it is against *infants baptisme*; infant-age *then* was as *uncapable* of understanding that rite, or the Covenant whereto it consigned, as it is *now*.

s. 15. To that difference assigned by some, in answer to this argument, that *Circumcision left an impression in the flesh, the signification whereof might in the future be understood, which Baptisme doth not.* It is replyed, That the *character* impressed by *Circumcision*, was not *physically*, but by *institution* significant of the Covenant of grace. To which it is consequent, that *that impress* no further *signified*, than as by *instruction* the children were taught what the *ends* were of Circumcision, and that they were *circumcised* for those ends. In which kind Baptisme may be significative, though no sensible character be thereby impressed, for *children may be instructed that, and why, they were baptized, and by this instruction Baptisme signifie as much to these, as Circumcision to those.*

The Argument.

If *Baptisme* consigne the *same* grace *essentially*, which *circumcision* consigned, be applied on the *same* ground *essentially*, on which *circumcision* was applied, and *all* the children of incovenanted persons be as much inrighted to that *ground*, as capable of that *grace*, and

and *consignation* thereof by baptisme, as any were by Circumcision, then is it as lawfull to baptize *all the children* of incovenanted persons, as it was to *circumcise any*. But *Baptisme* doth consigne the *same* grace *essentially*, &c. Therefore is it as lawfull to *baptize all the children*, &c.

CHAP. XI.

The children of Covenanters are relatively Holy.

S. 1. A Second consideration or Argument, whereby the second generall Proposition (*That to some infants*, viz. *the children of incovenanted persons, the Covenant of grace, in its visible administration, actually belongs*) may be proved, is conteined in the Apostle's reasoning, 1. *Cor.* 7.14. The *scope* whereof (inclusively with its context) is

is to resolve a double *scruple*, concerning which the Church of *Corinth* consulted the Apostle. First, whether cohabitation of *believers*, with unbelieving yoke-fellows (formerly married) were *pious*, *religious*, and might be continued without *defilement of conscience*? or Secondly, whether to put away *defilement*, the *Believers* ought to put away those *Unbelievers*? The *last* of these is consequent to the *first*. The Apostle therefore first *denies* and forbids the *last*. v. 12, 13. and next inforceth his inhibition, by *affirming* and confirming the *first*. v. 14, 15, *&c.*

s. 2. The argument, *v.* 14. is *ab opposito*. The conjugal *unbelieving* relative is *sanctified* by the *believing* correlate. This argument is *instanced à pari*: else were your *children* unclean, but now are they *holy*. The rational particle γὰρ *For* marks the argument: the argumentative particles ἐπεὶ ἄρα *Else* νυνὶ δὲ *But now*, mark the instance.

s. 3. Not understanding of *words* causeth misunderstanding of *things*; in regard therefore some have laboured to obscure the words of this text, I shall first endeavour to discover

discover *the Grammar*, next the *logique* of them: First *sanctified, holy*, signifie *separated to God*. The ground and rule of which *separation* is the *Covenant* of God, *Dan.* 8. 24. compared with *ch.* 11. 28, 30 *Psal.* 50. 5. 1. *Tim.* 4. 5. Which *Covenant* (though not expressed in the argument) is implied in that *faith* (not separable from its object, the Covenant,) to whose efficiencie, this *sanctification* is attributed.

§. 4. This general notion of *holiness* is differenced, in the particular application, according to the different ways, and degrees of *Covenant-separation*. There is holiness in us, *inherent holiness*: and holiness on us, *relative holiness*. The text I conceive intends principally (if not only) the last.

§. 5. *Relative holiness* is either primarie and direct, or secondarie and reductive. Persons *directly* comprized in the Covenant, & *immediately* thereby *separated to God*, in state and relation, are said to be *Holy* primarily, directly, and immediately. Persons *reductively* comprized in the Covenant, and *mediately* thereby *separated to God*, are relatively

Holy ſecondarily, reductively, and mediately. In the former way incovenanted *children* are in the *inſtance* ſaid to be *relatively Holy*, *i. e.* ſeparated to God *immediately*, being *directly* comprized in the *Covenant*, as joynt-fœderates with their parents. In the latter way is the *unbeliever* in the *argument* ſaid to be *relatively ſanctified* by the *Believer*, i. e. ſeparated to God reductively, and mediately, in ſo much as the believer being (not only relatively, but) inhærently *ſeparated to God*, improves religiouſly, and ſanctifiedly (*i. e. to God, and for God*) by faith in the Covenant, all his concernments, his meat and drink, his afflictions and infirmities, and in the text, his *cohabitation with, and injoyment of his unbelieving correlate.*

§. 6. Here a reaſon may be collected, why the Apoſtle *varies* his phraze, from the *third* perſon in the argument, to the *ſecond* in the inſtance: *viz.* Becauſe though the ſecondarie and remote relative *ſanctification* is peculiar to the ſavingly *believer*, (in regard it ariſeth not *immediately* from the Covenant it ſelf, but by the *mediate* grace of the Incovenanted;)

nanted:) yet the primarie and direct relative *holiness* (flowing immediately from the Covenant it self) is of equal extent with the *Covenant*, in its external administration. So that some who have not, and whose next parents had not *inherent holiness*, on accompt of their external Covenant-relation, are often in Scripture called *relatively Holy*: thus *Ezra* mentions the *Holy seed*, ch. 9. 2. thus the collective Iews (destroyed by *Antiochus*) are called the *Holy people*, Dan. 8. 24. the Church of the Gentiles collectively a *Holy nation*, 1. *Pet.* 2. 9. alluding to the like compellation given to collective Israel, *Ex.* 19. 6. yet many, yea most of *these* and their next *parents* were not inherently *Holy*.

s. 7. This *variety* of phraze serves likewise to evidence, that *holiness* is not attributed to *children*, in the *instance*, in the same way, or after the same manner, as it is attribute to the *unbeliever*, in the argument: For though the *verbe* and *noune* have materially the same significate, yet the *verb* in the manner of signifying connotates implicitely an *object*, about which the *sanctification* thereby signified,

signified, is exercised, (as 1. Tim. 4. 4, 5 plainly evidenceth;) in regard whereof the *children* of Infidels and the *afflictions* of the Saints may be said to be *sanctified to believers*: yet can neither be said to be *Holy*.

s. 8. I conclude therefore, that though *sanctified* in the *argument*, and *Holy* in the *instance*, agree in the general notion of *relative separation to God*: yet in the particular application, there is a double difference, First *sanctified* in the *argument*, signifies secondarily, mediately, and reductively, *Holy* in the *instance* signifies primarily, immediately, and directly, *separated to God*. Secondly, *sanctified* in the *argument*, is the proper effect of *justifying* faith. The *unbeliever* is sanctified by the *believer*; *Holy* in the *instance* is the common effect of external Covenant-relation. *Your children are holy*.

s. 9. One thing more is considerable in the verb *sanctified*, the Greek is ἡγίασται in the preter perfect-tense, *hath been sanctified*. Apprehension of former *defilement*, by cohabitation with *unbelieving* yoke-fellows, troubled the consciences of some *believing Corinthians*:

rinthians: fear of future *defilement* by the like, moved them to the ſuppoſed remedie of *ſeparation*; as a cordial for the *preter*, and an antidote for the *future*, the Apoſtle emphatically tells them, *the unbeliever hath been ſanctified. q. d.* Let not your hearts be troubled for your *cohabitation paſt*; neither let fear ingage you to withdraw from *cohabitation future*, for not only now, but ever ſince your converſion to the Faith, your cohabitation hath been ſanctified. *The unbeliever hath been ſanctified by the believer.*

s. 10. Secondly, ἐν *By*. I ſhall not contend about the tranſlation of this præpoſition, whether *by*, or *to*: Neither of them will advantage the *Anabaptiſts*, nor prejudice the *Orthodox*. Yet I believe, this particle (though ſometimes uſed for εἰς *Vnto*,) is never uſed for *To* the Characteriſtical of the *Dative caſe*; whereas the uſe of it for διὰ *By* is very frequent.

s. 11. Thirdly, *Husband*, *wife*, i. e. Firſt, the *believing* husband, the *believing* wife. Firſt ſuch as ſcrupled in *Conſcience*. Secondly ſuch as deſired *direction*. Thirdly ſuch as

were subject to the *Churches Authoritie*. Fourthly such as the Apostle calls *brother*, and *sister*, v. 12. 15. Therefore *believing*. Secondly *As believers*, *As* specificatively: not barely *as* husband, *as* wife: but *as* believing husband, *as* believing wife. This is intelligible, First by the constant *opposition* in this efficiencie to the *unbelieving*. What appertains to husband, or wife (as such) may equally be attributed to the *unbeliever*, as well as *believer*: but this *sanctifying* efficiencie is throughout particularly attributed to the *believer*, never to the *unbeliever*. Secondly by the paralel, *v.* 16. wherein the *husband* and *wife* are onely named: yet the *believing* husband and wife, (and *as believing*) intended; under that notion they are there efficients of that *Salvation*, under the same notion here of this *sanctification*.

s. 12. Fourthly *your Children*; *Children i. e.* natural and adopted, both are comprized in the *covenant*, and *separated* by it: wherefore as the *word*, so the *sense* includes both.

Your Children, *i. e.* not the Children in common of the whole citie: but your children

dren in ſpecial, reſpecting the Church and Covenant-intereſt, of (at leaſt) one parent, as the ground of this Holineſs.

s. 13. Fifthly *Holy, i. e.* ſeparated to God, by external covenant relation. It is obſervable, that if *either parent*, under the legal diſpenſation, was in *Covenant*, the *child* was in *covenant*, and inrighted to circumciſion; ſee this exemplified as to the Father, in *Moſes's child*, Exod. 4. 24, 25, 26. to the Mother in *Timothie*, *Act.* 16. 1, 3. The Apoſtle in like kind takes it *pro confeſſo* (under the Goſpel diſpenſation) that if either *parent* be a Church member, the *children* are *Holy*, and (I inferr) if *Holy* inrighted to *baptiſme*.

s. 14. *Children* being thus externally *incovenanted*, immembered with the *parent*, and for that reaſon externally *Holy*, let the *Anabaptiſts* define, what *degree* of *faith* incovenanteth, immembereth the *parent*, and that will alſo define, what *degree* of *faith* incovenanteth, immembereth the *children*. Which being a ſufficient *caution*, againſt that *ſophiſme*, (concerning the *Believing* intended in this text) wherein Mr. *Tombes* ſo much

glorieth; I referr the further discoverie of my judgement herein, to its *proper* place in my promised discourse on the *Covenants*.

s. 15. Sixthly *Vnclean*, *i. e.* (metaphorically) *excluded* the Church, and *Covenant*, (as the legal unclean excluded the camp of Israel.) The *Gentiles* were thus *unclean*, till *God* by admitting them to *Covenant*, *cleansed them*, Act. 10. 14, 15. *Peter's* ἀκάθαρτον *Vnclean*, is exegeticall of his κοινὸν *Common*, and implies that *Holiness* is formally Covenant-*separation*, whereunto this *Vncleanness* (therefore called *common*) is opposed, 1. *Macc.* 1. 63. *Heb.* 10. 29. yet so, that the opposition's not adæquate. Some things were *unclean*, whose opposites were *clean*, but not *Holy*.

s. 16. The *grammatical* sense of the words being rightly conceived: their *logical* argumentation may thus be disposed.

Matrimonial cohabitation, and injoyment (since conversion) *sanctified* by *Believers*, may (and ought to) be continued without conscience-defilement. The cohabitation of the *believing* Corinthians with their *unbelieving* correlates is such, The *unbelieving husband*

husband hath been *sanctified* by the *wife*: and the *unbelieving wife* hath been *sanctified* by the *husband*. Ergo, their matrimonial cohabitation, and injoyment may (and ought to) be continued without conscience-defilement.

s. 17. The *Instance*, inforcing this *assumption*, may thus be disposed.

If by *common* external Covenant-interest the *children* of Church-members, are externally *Holy* then by *saving* internal *Covenant*-interest, *matrimonial* cohabitation with, and injoyment of *unbelieving* correlates, hath (since conversion) been sanctified by the *Saving believers*. But all Christians confess the former, *Your children are Holy*; you ought therefore to conclude the later, Vnbelieving Correlates have (since conversion) been sanctified by the Believers. *Children* of Church-members, are not as the *children* of Pagans; *Spouses* therefore of saving Believers, are not as the *Spouses* of Infidels. *Those* are *Holy*, *these* are *sanctified*.

s. 18. I conceive this instance argueth *à pari*, and supposeth, First, that as the *parentals*,

tals, ſo the *conjugal* relation is *approved*, and bleſſed by the *Covenant*. Secondly, that whatever in the general is *approved*, and bleſſed by the *Covenant*, may in the particular be *ſanctified*, *i.e.* ſeparated to God. Thirdly, that all *ſanctification* agrees, in that generical nature of *ſeparation*, though in regard of different *ends*, and *degrees*, it be (in the particulars) *diverſified* according to the *different influences* of the Covenant thereon. Fourthly, that it was an unqueſtionable poſition among all *Chriſtians* that by *external* Covenant-*influence*, the *Children* of all Church-members, are *Holy*, (*i. e.* externally ſeparated to God) directly and immediately. And therefore hence the Apoſtle argues, that conſequently by *ſaving* Covenant *influence*, all Covenant injoyments of a *Believer* (and eſpecially his *matrimonial* relation, of neareſt concernment) are reductively and conſequentially *ſanctified*, (*i. e.* ſo ſeparated to God, that the Believer injoys *God* in *them*, and *them* for *God*.)

On theſe ſuppoſitions, the conſequence is evident, the inſtance forceable, the argument concluſive. s. 19. Note

s. 19. Note here, the *vanitie* (if not prophaneſs) of theſe *Anabaptiſts*, who conclude on this *medium*, the *Vnbelieving* fornicator is *ſanctified*, by his *Believing* whore: As if, the Covenant *approv'd* and bleſs'd *fornication*: or becauſe it *ſanctifies* what it *approves*, therefore what it *condemns*. *Sanctified* ſuperads to *lawfull*, all that is *lawfull* is not *ſanctified*: all that is *ſanctified* is firſt *lawfull*: ſo *fornication* is not, ſo *matrimonie* is. The *Believer* can improve his *Covenant-intereſs* by faith, and pray for a bleſſing, on his *matrimonial relations*, with an *unbeliever*: On *fornication* he cannot.

s. 20. And as this their Arguing is *vain*, ſo the *ſenſe* they impoſe on this text is *abſurd* (Sanctified, *i. e.* (ſay they) civilly lawfull. Holy, *i. e.* (ſay they) lawfully begotten.) Let themſelves judge of this *charge*, conſidering theſe *evidences*.

s. 21. Firſt theſe words (*Sanctified*, *Holy*) never ſignifie *legitimate*, in any Writer *Divine* or *prophane*. And firſt, it is not imaginable, that the *Apoſtle*, reſolving a caſe of *conſcience*, ſhould chooſe a *Language* not *intelligible*,

ligible, or give an *uncertain* sound; that's unwarrantable, in all *religious* instances: most, in cases of *Conscience*. Secondly, it is not justifiable, that men (without any *necessitie*, but meerly to evacuate the force of an argument) should impose *abusive* significations on *Scripture words*, for like use whereof, there is no *pretension* in any other instance. *God* says *Holy*, but means *Legitimate*, He means not as he speaks, is (too *hard* though) an *easie* answer.

s. 22. Secondly, consider the coherence. First, the *efficiencie* of this *privilege* (denoted by the Verbe *sanctified*) is appropriated to the *Believer*, who is constantly propounded as the proper *cause* of it, (or if translated *to* the proper *object*, about whom it is exercised:) But *matrimonial* lawfulness is mutual; as applicable to the *unbeliever*, as to the *believer*. Secondly, the *privileges* here instanced are *peculiar*, the *first* to saving-Believers, the *second* to external Church-members: but lawfulness of marriage, legitimation of children, is *common* to Pagans. Thirdly, the *medium* in arguing, must be *notius quæsito*: but in this

this argument (the *children* are legitimate, *Ergo*, the *marriage* is lawfull,) the *quæsitum* is *notus medio*. Lawfulness of marriage must be supposed, before legitimation of children can be concluded.

s. 23. Thirdly, consider some consequences. First, if *sanctified* be the same with *civilly lawfull*, then to none, injoyments are *civilly lawfull*, to whom they are not *religiously sanctified*, a consequence of sad consequence, if improved by *Germane Anabaptists*, in whose esteem Noe *children*, few *Christians* are *saints*: much plunder, all sequestrations are *lawfull*.

s. 24. Secondly, if *Holy* be the same with *legitimate*, then First, Vnbelievers children are all *illegitimate*. Secondly, legitimate children are all *Holy*. The Scripture, doth conclude, not as the first, but extends matrimonial lawfulness to *all*, *Heb.* 13. 4. doth not conclude as the second, but appropriates Church-holiness to *some*, *Ezra* 9. 2.

Many other inconveniences might be propounded, but these (I conceive) sufficient, to evidence the absurditie, and unreasonablenese of that exposition.

The Argument.

To thoſe who are relatively *Holy*, by a viſible direct Covenant ſeparation, the *Covenant* of grace, in its viſible adminiſtration, actually belongeth. *Children* of incovenanted perſons, are thus relatively *Holy*. Therefore, to them the *Covenant* of grace, in its viſible adminiſtration, actually belongeth: to which it is conſequent. *They ought to be Baptized.*

CHAP. XII.

The gratefull acceſs of little Children to Chriſt.

S. 1. A Third conſideration or argument to prove the *ſecond general propoſition*, is deducible from the expreſſes of our Saviour in word, & deed, (concerning the *gratefull acceſſ of little Children unto him*) recorded, *Math.* 19. 13. 14, 15. *Mark* 10. 13, 14, 15, 16, *Luke* 18. 15, 16, 17.

s. 2. Firſt, this *acceſs* was *viſible*; for otherwiſe,

wise, First the parents could not have *brought* them. Secondly, the Disciples could not have *hindered* them. Thirdly, Christ's direction for future access had been *impertinent*. Who can *bring* others to, who can *keep* others from *invisible grace?*

s. 3. Secondly, the *Subjects* of this *access* are *Children, little children*; Their *infancie* is signified, First by the term; that which *Luke* useth βρέφη is peculiar to *little children*, and for most part *sucking children*, Luke 1. 41, 44, and ch. 2. 12, 16. *Acts* 7. 19. 1. *Pet.* 2. 2. Secondly, by the distinct acts. First of the *parents* (probably) προσέφερον they *brought* them: the *adult* could have *come* without bringing. Secondly, of the *Disciples*, they *invited* the adult, yet would have *debarred* these. Thirdly, of *Christ* ἐναγκαλισάμενος first He *took* them up in his *arms*. Secondly, He propounds them as exemplarie *patterns* to his *Disciples*. And it is not probable either that *Christ* should *take up grown* men in his arms, or that such should thus be *exemplarie patterns* to his *Disciples*.

s. 4. The *design* for these *Subjects*. That

Chriſt by *prayer* ſhould *bleſs* them, (compare *Matthew* with *Mark*) and by *bleſſing conſecrate them to God*, ſignified by that *ſymbole* (*impoſition of hands*) accuſtomed in ſuch *benedictions*, thus *Iſaac* bleſſed and dedicated *Iacob* to God, *Gen.* 27. thus *Iacob*, *Ephraim*, and *Manaſſeh*, Gen. 48.

s. 5. That *cure* of ſome bodily diſtemper, ſhould be the *deſign* of theſe *parents* in this *acceſs* is not imaginable. Firſt becauſe the *Diſciples* admitted indifferently *all*, even *madmen*, to healing. Secondly, they could not poſſibly apprehend ſuch a *cure* unworthy of *Chriſt*, or improper to declare his *Almightineſs*. Laſtly, thus to limit *Chriſts bleſſing* and *prayer* to *temporals only*, ſeems injurious to it and Scripture. Evident it is, that *want of underſtanding* ſecludes not the *infant-age* from *Chriſt*: He commands their acceſs. Nor from the *graces* of Chriſt; He bleſſeth them. nor from the *ſignal* of grace; He lays his hands upon them.

s. 6. Fourthly. the *approbation* of this *deſigne*, *de facto*, *de jure*, determining hereof in an ordinarie *rule* for ordinarie *practice*.

Firſt,

First *de facto*, *Suffer little Children to come unto me and forbid them not*. This determination is not peculiar to these *individualls*, but extensive to Children *in specie*, as appeares first by the phraze, which is not limited, *Suffer these*, but indefinite *Suffer little Children*. Secondly by the cohærence, first Christ was *displeased* with the Disciples for prohibiting their access; it was therefore the Disciples duty to have known that *these infants* were *inrighted* to such access; this the Disciples could not know of these *infants numerically*, but by knowing that it was their duty to suffer *infants specifically* to come to *Christ*, and not forbid them. Secondly, This determination containes a *præcept* to the Disciples aswell for their *future*, as present *direction*, and how such future direction should be *limited* to those individualls is not conceivable.

s. 7. Secondly, *de jure*, *of such is the Kingdome of Heaven*. Whether the visible Church (as *Math.* 13. 24. and *Math.* 8: 11, 12:) or whether the Kingdome of *grace*, or *glorie* singlie, or in conjunction be here understood: yet *a present visible relation of little Chil-*

dren (in ſpecie) to King Ieſus, and right of acceſs for that reaſon, is hereby determined.

s. 8. Firſt, this *relation* and *right* is determined as *preſent*: for firſt, it could not otherwiſe conclude the *negatum*, *i. e.* their preſent acceſs. Secondly, the tenſe is not *erit*, but *eſt*, not *ſhall be*, on future calling, but *is*, at preſent.

s. 9. Secondly, this *relation* and *right* is determined as *viſible*, for firſt on this ground and reaſon Chriſt is *displeaſed* with his Diſciples, for *non-admiſſion* of children, at preſent. Secondly, on this ground and reaſon Chriſt *directs* his Diſciples to the *admiſſion* of children for the future: and this *relation* & *right* could neither be a reaſon, or ground to the one, or the other, if it were not *revealed* and *viſible*. Yea it is not intelligible that *Chriſt* ſhould be *angry* for not admitting, or *direct* to the admitting of thoſe, whoſe *right* to admiſſion is *ſecret* or not revealed. Thirdly, Chriſt viſibly *took* them up in his *arms*, and viſibly *bleſſed* them, and thoſe certainly whom he viſibly *bleſſeth*, viſibly *relate* unto him.

s. 10. Third-

s. 10. Thirdly, this present visible relation, and right is determined, as belonging *to such as little children inclusively*, i. e. *to them and such as them*. That in this expression (of SUCH) little children are included, appears by these arguments. First, *Little children* are here made patterns to others, in right and relation to the *Kingdome of Heaven*, as *Matth.* 20. 30. the *Angels* of God are made *patterns* of our state and condition in *Heaven*: and as there the immunitie of the *Angels* from marriage and generation, so here the right and relation of *children*, either must be included: or that for which they are made patterns is not verified in them.

s. 11. Secondly, if *such*, as little children, be inrighted to the *kingdome of heaven*, because they are *such*, then certainly *little children* are thereto inrighted. The trite rule is certain & undeniable, *Quod convenit tali, quatenus tale, convenit omni tali.*

s. 12. Thirdly, if *little children* be here considered meerly as *resemblances*, & not included in this determination of *right*, as subjects thereof, then first the *argument* is very

uncon-

unconcludent of the direction, it might as consequentially be inferred, *suffer sheep* to come unto *Christ*, and do not hinder them, because those to whom Gods Kingdome belongs, must be like sheep; as *suffer little children to come unto Christ and forbid them not*, meerly on this ground of similitude and resemblance. Secondly, Christ's *displeasure* against his Disciples had been very unreasonable, (if not unjust) for there is nothing *external* but is capable of *spiritual accommodations*: and when, or how *Christ* would thus make use of *little children* they could not possibly know, till he revealed it, and therefore could not be *faultie*, in forbidding the access, *before such revelation*.

s. 13. That conceipt of an *extraordinarie blessing*, & *private designe*, intended by *Christ*, in this instance, will be easily disproved; by considering that the *blessing* was such, and the *designe* such as the *Disciples* ought to have been *acquainted* with, and with the *right* of admittance which these *infants* had thereunto. Otherwise their *exclusion* of them had not been *blame worthy*: but with *Christ's private designe*,

design, or *extraordinary blessings*, not revealed, they could not be *acquainted*; therefore *such* in this instance, cannot *solely* (if it all) be intended. And plainly what *Christ's design* was, appears by his subsequent acts; He declareth their *interest* in Him, his *good will* to them, propounds them as a *pattern* to his Disciples, *taketh* them up in his *arms*, and *blesseth* them. From each whereof severally might be argued the *Covenant interest* of this *species*, or sort of mankind: but I shall comprize them in this one.

The Argument.

Those who have present visible right to the *Kingdome of Heaven*, and for that reason, to *access* unto Christ, to the *blessing* of Christ, and to the *signal* thereof, to them the *Covenant* of grace in its *visible* administration actually belongs: But *Children* of incovenanted persons are such. Therefore to them the Covenant of grace in its visible administration actually belongs. To which it is consequent, *they ought to be baptized.*

The Conclusion.

Christian Parents, your *Children* by nature are children of *wrath*, if the *Covenant of grace* visibly belong not to them, they visibly belong not to *Christ*, and they who visibly belong not to *Christ*, visibly belong to the *Devil*: which is one of the *terrible*, yet necessarie consequentes of the *Children dis-covenanting* doctrine. But this, and others (*as destructive*) I shall instance no further, both because the *contrary-minded* commonly answer such instances with *rage*, not with reason, and because, though this contracted Discourse, cannot possibly produce all the *Evidentes* recorded in Scripture for the *Covenant-interest*, and *Baptisme* of Children: nor improve to the utmost all those produced; yet herein (I presume) are sufficient to satisfie the unprejudic'd, in perusal whereof I pray thee, (*Christian*) First, *pray for light*, the *Sun* is not discernable but by its own *beams*; nor the Father of *Light*, but by *light* from the Father. *Luther* professed that he discovered

discovered God's mind most by *prayer*. Secondly, *Labor for grace*, when the *grace* of Baptisme is most entertain'd in the *heart*, the *Doctrine* of Baptisme will best be understood by the *head*. Those *Saints* who improve against *Satan's* assaults, the *grace* of God sealed and conveyed in *baptisme*, can easily repel all temptations to *Anabaptisme*: to which purpose, 'tis very observable, that though this uncertain *wind* hath in this Countie *carried away*, some from Christ's visible *floor*, *palea de vis fidei*, *chaff* of unstable belief, or *immature grains* of the weaker (in judgement) either age, or sex; yet not any one (that I know) of the *ancient*, *experienc'd*, *settled Professors*. So applicable is that which *Tertullian* observed, *Hæreses de quorundam infirmitatibus habent quod valent*. It is *darkness* that thus affrighteth, it is *weakness* that staggereth; Oh how necessarie is it to studie *Catechismes*, before *Controversies*? *Children* of Covenanters are not excluded by *Christs commission*, are capable of the *ends*, and inrighted to the *Covenant-ground* of baptisme, their *former* interest is not *repealed*, they are *Holy*, *received*, *blessed*

by Christ, and intitled to the *Kingdom of Heaven*: On such *Scripture-Evidences* (not only some particular societies but) the whole *Church* of Christ hath *universally* practised the *baptisme* of infants; which to such Evidences adds this *Evidence*, that they are much clearer, than what to the contrarie is produced by any; whereof we have cause to suspect that the *Anabaptists* are conscious, in regard their *disputes* are generally *negative*, by eluding our arguments, not *positive* confirming their own. *What Anabaptist breathing can give one Scripture instance, of one child (born of Christian Parents) baptized, when grown to years of discreation, to answer for himself?*

Dear Christians, *Quos detinere non potest Satan in via veteris cœcitate, circumscribit & decipit novi itineris errore*, Cypr. Sathan despairs to keep up *Papisme*, therefore designes to set up *Anabaptisme*. *But the God of all grace who hath called us into his eternal glorie, by Christ Iesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you; to him be glory for ever, and ever; Amen.* 1. Pet. 5. 10, 11.